

2009-2010

VOLUME 9-10.

57497

CHRONICA

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED



CHRONICA

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED
HUNGARY



Editor-in-chief:

Lajos Kövér

Editors:

Zsolt Hunyadi, Andrea Kökény

Editorial Board:

*László Koszta, Tibor Almási, László J. Nagy,
Enikő Sajti, Sándor Csernus*

Proof Readers:

Frederik Felskau (Germany)

Pongracz Sennyey (USA)

Marie-Madeleine de Cevins (France)

László Gálffy, Márta Horváth, Erzsébet Szabó, Endre Hárs

Articles appearing in the CHRONICA are abstracted in
HISTORICAL ABSTRACT and AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE

ISSN 1588 2039

Published by the Institute of History,
University of Szeged
2. Egyetem u.
H-6722 Szeged
Hungary

e-mail: chronica@primus.arts.u-szeged.hu
<http://primus.arts.u-szeged.hu/chronica>

Printed in Hungary, on acid-free paper
by E-press Ltd, Szeged

Copyright © 2010, by the authors and the editors

Contents



LAJOS KÖVÉR	
Lectori salutem!	3
SÁNDOR LÁSZLÓ TÓTH	
The White and Black Hungarians	5
LÁSZLÓ BALOGH	
The Turks in the Vita Sancti Athanasii Athonitae (Vardariota-Turks or Hungarians?)	15
MIKLÓS HALMÁGYI	
Identität und Fremdheitsvorstellungen in der früheren ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung und deren europäische Beziehungen	26
GERGELY KISS	
Les aspects des activités des légats pontificaux en Hongrie aux XI ^e -XIII ^e siècles	38
ZSOLT HUNYADI	
Hungary and the Second Crusade	55
ANDREA KISS	
Fertő River (A Low Water Level Signal or Something Else?)	66
ÉVA TEISZLER	
Matthias Corvinus und das lateinische Quellenwerk des 15. Jahrhunderts in Ungarn	78
MARTYN RADY	
Fiscal and Military Developments in Hungary during the Jagello Period ..	86
ZOLTÁN HOROGSZEGI-KRISZTINA RÁBAI	
Die linguistischen Lehren eines mittelalterlichen Rechnungsbuches (Das Rechnungsbuch Herzog Sigismunds)	100
VLADIMÍR RÁBIK	
Character and Appearance of Ruthenian and Wallachian Settlement in Eastern Slovakia in the Middle Ages	107
BEÁTA VARGA	
Die russisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen vom Andrusower Vertrag 1667 bis zum „ewigen Frieden“ von 1686	137
ANDREA KÖKÉNY	
Oregon Politicians and Newspaper Editors of the Territorial Period	151
ABDALLAH ABDEL-ATY	
Supplementary to the History of Egyptian-Hungarian Relations	168
JÓZSEF N. SZABÓ	
Cultural Cooperation between Hungary and Yugoslavia (1945-1948)	177

PETER ÁKOS FERWAGNER

- Discorde chez les Pieds Noirs (Les partis dans l'Algérie française, 1945-1954) 190

PÉTER VUKMAN

- The British Foreign Office on the Situation of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, 1951-53 203

MARTEN SEPPEL

- Three definite conclusions on indefinable serfdom 213

Theses

ZOLTÁN PRANTNER

- Yemen and the Socialist Countries, 1955-1970 220

BALÁZS SZÉLINGER

- Hungary and Ethiopia: Formal and Informal Relations, 1868-1941 224

SZABOLCS POLGÁR

- Eastern Europe and the international trade in the eighth-tenth centuries (on the basis of written sources) 228

Lectori salutem!



We invite the gentle reader to welcome this jubilee volume. It was a decade ago that an annual was launched by the Institute of History at the University of Szeged – with the appropriate title *Chronica*. It's been ten years now! Although ten years do not seem much on a chronicler's scale, a decade is still long enough to call for summary and recapitulation.

What was the aim in the beginning? What were the motivations behind the project? To what extent were our hopes realized? Was it worth the effort? How should we go on? We could ask a lot of similar questions.

We should not spoil this quiet jubilee, still, we have to ask a severe question: was it worth it or is there a point at all in financing a foreign language history journal at own costs in Hungary in the first decade of the 21st century among serious financial restrictions?

What did the editor-in-chief, Prof. László J. Nagy promise ten years ago?

"The individual members and the departments of the Institute have a remarkable international cooperational network, but the aim is to extend these connections to institutional level. With the help of this newly launched annual, foreign historians and readers will be able to gain insight into the research work of the scholars and colleagues of the Institute of History [...] On the other hand, this yearbook wishes to address not only professional historians and scholars, but also the average readers interested in history. The intention is to competently present Hungarian national history to foreigners. First of all, we regard it important that, due to language barriers, Hungarian history is not very much known even for foreign experts. Secondly, the change of the political system in Hungary undergone in the last decade, and consequently a more open way of thinking makes it possible to publish the results of our research about the history of Hungary as well as other countries and nations. Our special Central-East European and Hungarian research attitude may contribute to the investigation of world history and may also help in solving certain historical problems."

It is in connection with the "was it worth it?" question that the exclamation "we have lived to see it!" gains a special meaning. Yes, we have lived to see it, and it was worth the effort, and our hopes have been realized.

There is no reason to feel ashamed. It cannot be denied that the historians of Szeged have shown their work to the world and have been assessed. It is a fact that the volumes of the *Chronica* can be found on the shelves of the major libraries of the world. It is a fact that this representative publication carries considerable scholarly values. It is a fact that the *Chronica* has a special barter value. It is a fact

that the *Chronica* has become integral part of the international relations of the historians of Szeged.

Its strength and in a way its peculiar weakness lie in the fact that it is published in Szeged. Its strength is that it has proved that the staff of the Institute of History at the University of Szeged made their way even on international ground. With a fashionable and trite phrase of our age: we are competitive and marketable. This is the result of the *Chronica's* decade, and it is also the token of its future.

Besides the words of praise demanded by the jubilee, we also need to find an answer to the question: how to go on. It is a commonplace that the past has a peculiar significance for historians. The *Chronica's* strength and in a way its peculiar weakness lie in the fact that it is rooted in Szeged – we said above. The task, one element of the answer to the question of how to go on, has thus already been given.

How can we improve on its weakness? We should open up from provincialism, from its Szeged-rootedness and through this opening up the scholarly product of our significant international relations can get publicity in the *Chronica*. This lays new tasks on Zsolt Hunyadi who has been doing the arduous job of editing our journal for ten years and Andrea Kökény who has joined him recently. The next volumes are to present the first moves in this direction proving that the values of the past oblige us while we also have to meet new challenges and carry out new and new tasks. What gives rise to optimism is the fact that one of the keys to these tasks at the University of Szeged is in good hands, it is in the hand of the staff of the Institute of History.

Lajos Kövér
Head of Institute

The White and Black Hungarians

SÁNDOR LÁSZLÓ TÓTH



This study tries to solve a mystery of early Hungarian (Magyar) history; namely the problem of who the White and Black Hungarians were, why they were named so, where they lived and where their territories were. This problem can be connected to the general problem of color symbols in the early Middle Ages,¹ especially in the ninth–eleventh centuries, when some sources refer to White or Black Ugrians/Hungarians. First we shall evaluate the sources, then the different hypotheses about them and, finally, formulate a new possible approach.

The few sources on White and Black Hungarians are from the eleventh–twelfth century. The earliest sources are the two reports of Bruno of Querfurt (c. 974–1009), who was a German/Saxon missionary bishop/archbishop. He spent several years in Hungary during the early reign of the first Hungarian king, Saint Stephen (997/1000–1038), and tried to convert the pagan Hungarians. His missionary activity began in 1003 and ended between 1004 and 1008. Later Bruno visited Poland, Russia (Rus), he went to the Pechenegs and the Prussians, and suffered martyrdom in March 1009.² Bruno of Querfurt may be identified with a certain monk named Boniface, who performed missionary work at the lower parts of Hungary in this period.³ He was a prolific writer. In his work about the Polish hermits (written around 1006–1008) entitled *Vita quinque fratrum eremitarum* he made a personal remark: “neglecting the Prussians, where because of the new

¹ L. de Saussure, “Le système cosmologique Sino-Iranien,” *Journal Asiatique* 202 (1923), 235–297; for the color symbols H. Ludat, “Farbenzeichnungen in Völkernamen,” *Saeculum* 4 (1953), 138–155; O. Pritsak, “Orientierung und Farbsymbolik,” *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 377–383.

² D. H. G. Voigt, *Brun von Querfurt*. Stuttgart 1907; G. Thoroczkay, in *Az államalapítás korának írott forrásai*. [The Written Sources of the Foundation of the Hungarian State] ed. Gy. Kristó, Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár 15, Szeged 1999, (henceforth: ÁKÍF) 78–79.

³ For the activity of Boniface, see *Legenda S. Stephani regis maior*, in E. Szentpétery (ed.), *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* I–II. (henceforth: SRH), Budapestini 1937–1938. II. 382.; *Vita et passio Sancti Brunoni episcopi et martyris Quarfordensis*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historiae. Scriptores*. (cited as MGH SS) I–XXXIV. Hannoverae-Lipsiae 1826–1934. (Reprint 1963–1964) XXX/2. 1363–1364; for the identification of Boniface with Bruno of Querfurt see Gy. Györffy, *István király és műve*. [King Stephen and his Activity] Budapest 1977, 172–173.

saint, the killed Adalbert, I should have gone for a right cause, I had started to preach the gospel to the Black Hungarians [*Nigris Ungris*] to whom I had boarded a ship [from Regensburg] and headed towards the Eastern parts."⁴ The second source is the letter of Bruno of Querfurt to the German king/emperor Henry II (written around the end of 1008 or beginning of 1009). Bruno wrote that he had left the Hungarians, where he had stayed for a long time in vain. He remarked at the end of his letter that "I have heard about the Black Hungarians [*Nigris Ungris*] – whom the first legateship of Saint Peter had visited, which never goes in vain, though some of them were blinded by ours with great sin – who were all converted and became Christians."⁵

The next source is the Chronicle of Ademar Cabannensis (c.988–1034), writing the history of the Franks up to 1028, which contains two important passages on White and Black Hungary. Although there has been a debate whether the C-variant containing these reports, can or cannot be considered authentic (interpolated?), it is a very interesting and important source.⁶ Ademar mentioned a certain Bruno of Augsburg, who "went to Hungary, called White Hungary [*Alba Ungria*] to be differentiated from another, Black Hungary [*Ungrie Nigre*], because people living there are dark colored, like the Ethiopians."⁷ In another passage, after remembering the martyrdom of Bruno, the chronicler remarked, that "King Stephen of Hungary attacked Black Hungary [*Ungria Nigra*], and converted the whole land to Christianity by force, fear and love."⁸

⁴ "Vita quinque fratrum eremitarum – Vita vel passio Benedicti et Johannis sociorumque suorum," in *Monumenta Poloniae historica*. Nova series. IV/3. Warszawa 1973, 51–52. (H. Karwasinska); F. A. Gombos, *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae*. 3 vols. Budapestini 1937–1938. (Cited as Gombos, *Catalogus*) III: 2569. "Et dimissis Pruzis, quo propter novum sanctum, Adalbertum, occisum, iustior me causa duxisset, Nigris Ungris, quo tunc versus in partes orientis navim conscendi, sinistro opere et infirmo humero evangelium portare cepi", in Hungarian see ÁKÍF, 87. (translated by G. Thoroczkay).

⁵ Gombos, *Catalogus* I: 430. "Audiui enim de nigris Ungris ad quos, que nunquam frustra vadit, sancti Petri prima legatio venit, quamvis nostri – quod deus indulgeat – cum peccato magno aliquos cecarent; quod conversi omnes facti sunt christiani."; see also Gy. Györffy, ed., *Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima*, Vol. 1, Budapest 1992, 46; in Hungarian see ÁKÍF 91. (translated by G. Thoroczkay).

⁶ J. Gerics and E. Ladányi, "A Szent István lándzsájára és koronájára vonatkozó források értelmezése," [The Interpretation of Sources Referring to the Lance and Crown of Saint Stephen] *Levéltári Szemle* 40:2 (1990), 3.

⁷ Gombos, *Catalogus* I: 16. "abiit in provinciam Ungriam, quae dicitur Alba Ungria, ad differentiam alteri Ungrie Nigre, pro eo quo populus est colore fusco velut Etiopes"; for its recent edition see *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*. Cura et studio: P. Bourgain, iuvamen praestantibus R. Landes – G. Pon. Turnhout 1999. (cited as *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*) 152; in Hungarian see ÁKÍF, 165–166 (translated by F. Makk).

⁸ Gombos, *Catalogus* I. 16. "Stephanus rex Ungrie bello appetens Ungriam Nigram, tam vi quam timore et amore ad fidem veritatis totam illam terram convertere meruit"; for its recent edition see *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 155; for the Hungarian translation, ÁKIF, 168–169. (translated by F. Makk)

Our latest source is the Russian Primary Chronicle (*Povesty vremennih let* or *PVL*), written at the beginning of the twelfth century, which contains the earliest mention of White and Black Ugrians/Hungarians, using Byzantine sources. The PVL narrated about earlier events and rulers from the seventh century including the Bulgars, the White Ugrians, Emperor Heraclius of Byzantium (610–641) and Chosroes of Persia (596–628), and the Avars warring with emperor Heraclius. The PVL mentioned, that “afterwards came the White Ugrians, who inherited the Slavic country.”⁹ Later it is told, that “afterwards came the Pechenegs, then Black Ugrians marched beside Kiev, in the time of Oleg (879–912).”¹⁰

These six passages of three primary sources (Bruno, Ademar, PVL) constitute the rather small and controversial source-basis of hypotheses about the White and Black Hungarians. However, it should be noted, that from these six passages five mentioned the Black Hungarians/Hungary and only two referred to White Hungarians/Hungary.

The first hypothesis regarded the white and black distinction to be of ethnic origin. The White Ungarians were identified with the seven Hungarian (Magyar) tribes, while the Black Hungarians with the Qabars/Qavars of Khazar origin. According to one theory, one group of these Qabars/Black Hungarians lived on the territory of a Hungarian chieftain, Ajtony. This land of Ajtony lay east of river Tisza and north of river Danube, around the rivers of Temes and Maros. Bruno of Querfurt tried to baptize them in 1003 and later, but in vain. Ajtony was defeated by King Saint Stephen in 1008, and his Qabars/Black Hungarians were converted.¹¹ A similar argument accepted that the Black Hungarians were Qabars, and this denomination of Ademar in fact referred to their darker skin, contrasted with the lighter skin of White Hungarians. At the same time, this assumption located their territory to the southwestern parts of Hungary, west of river Danube and north of river Drava and Sava, the later bishopric of Pécs.¹² Another theory of ethnic differentiation is the so-called “double-conquest” of Hungarians. It is supposed, on the basis of *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, that the White Ugrians/Hun-

⁹ *The Russian Primary Chronicle*. Laurentian Text. tr. and ed. S. H. Cross, O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, Cambridge 1953. (cited as *Russian Primary Chronicle*) 55–56; for the Hungarian translation, see *A honfoglalás korának írott forrásai*, ed. Gy. Kristó, Szeged 1995, (henceforth: HKÍF) 170–172. (translated by I. Ferincz).

¹⁰ *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, 56.

¹¹ Györffy, István király, 166, 172–173; idem, *Tanulmányok a magyar állam eredetéről. A nemzetségtől a vármegyéig. A törzstől az orszáig. Kurszán és Kurszán vára*. [Studies on the Origin of the Hungarian State. From the Clans to the County. Kurszán and the Fortress of Kurszán] Budapest 1959, 76; idem, “A kabar kérdés,” [The Problem of Qabars] in idem, *A magyarság keleti elemei*. [The Eastern Elements of Hungarians] Budapest 1990, 92.

¹² Gy. Kristó, “A fekete magyarok és a pécsi püspökség alapítása,” [The Black Hungarians and the Foundation of the Bishopric of Pécs] *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica* (cited as AUSz AH) 82 (1985), 11–16; idem, *Írások Szent Istvánról és koráról*. [Writings on Saint Stephen and his Age] Szeged 2000, 79–87; F. Makk, *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196)*. [Hungarian Foreign Policy, 896–1196] Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár 2, Szeged 1996, 56.

garians settled in the Carpathian basin around 670–680, while the Turkish people of Árpád, the Black Ugrians/Hungarians invaded this homeland two centuries later, in 895.¹³

Another type of hypothesis claims this duality of white and black to be a political, tribal or territorial division inside the seven Hungarian tribes. According to the general opinion, the white color referred to the noble, ruling group, while the black color denoted the subjected, inferior group.¹⁴ There is another general theory that colors denoted the orientation of tribes following the four directions of the compass; the white meant a Western, the black a Northern, the blue an Eastern and the red a Southern location.¹⁵ Some researchers connected the Black Hungarians with just one Hungarian tribe. One hypothesis placed the Black Hungarians on the territory of Gyula (gyula was the second rank in the Hungarian tribal system), who was defeated by King Saint Stephen in 1002.¹⁶ Others supposed that the eastern Hungarian tribes, namely that of Gyula and Ajtony, living east of the river Tisza in the Carpathian basin, can be identified with the Black Hungarians. These tribal chiefs opposed King Stephen who defeated them (in 1002 and in 1003/1008).¹⁷ I have always regarded the Black Hungarians as Hungarians, opposing the king and Christianity, and identified them with the tribe of Gyula and/or Koppány.¹⁸ I also argued that the eastern tribes (Nyék, Kürtgyarmat, Jenő, Keszi) of the Hungarian tribal federation can be identified with the Black Hungarians of Turkish origin, living east of river Dnieper in their settlement called Etelköz, and living east of the river Danube after their conquest of the Carpathian basin in about 894–900. At the same time I regarded the tribe of the prince (kündü) descending from Árpád, the first prince of the Hungarian tribes, as White Hungarians and identified them with western Hungarian tribes (Megyer, Tarján, Kér), who were possibly Finno-Ugrians.¹⁹ This duality was also

¹³ Gy. László, *A kettős honfoglalás*. [The “Double-conquest”] Budapest 1978, 137–146.

¹⁴ See, for instance, László, *A kettős honfoglalás*, 147; P. B. Golden, *Khazar Studies. An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. Vol. 1, Budapest 1980, 103, 142; Pritsak, *Orientierung*, 379.

¹⁵ S. Tóth, “A fehér és fekete magyarok kérdéséhez,” *AUSz AH* 75 (1983), 7–8; Ludat, *Farbenzeichnungen*, 148.

¹⁶ J. Horváth, jr., “Székesfehérvár korai történetének néhány kérdése az írásos források alapján,” [Some Problems of the Early History of Székesfehérvár on the Basis of Written Sources], in A. Kralovánszky, ed., *Székesfehérvár évszázadai 1. Az államalapítás kora*, Székesfehérvár 1967, 107.

¹⁷ Gy. Balanyi, *Szent István* [Saint Stephen]. Budapest 1931, 14; P. Váczy, “Gyula és Ajtony,” [Gyula and Ajtony] in *Emlékkönyv Szentpétery Imre születésének 60-ik évfordulójára*. Budapest 1938, 502; idem, “A korai magyar történet néhány kérdéséről,” [Some Issues of Early Hungarian History], *Századok*, 1958, 333; B. Hóman and Gy. Szekfű, *Magyar Történet*. [Hungarian History] Budapest 1928, 182–183; Gy. Bónis, *István király*. [King Stephen] Budapest 1956, 127.

¹⁸ S. Tóth, “Kabarok és fekete magyarok.” [Qabars and Black Hungarians] *AUSz AH* 84 (1987), 27–28.

¹⁹ S. L. Tóth, “A fehér és fekete magyarok problematikájához.” [To the Problem of White and Black Hungarians], in *A honfoglalás ezer éve és a Vajdaság*, Novi Sad 1997, 81–94;

supported by the ruling tribe/people using for themselves the white color and for their opposition, the subjected tribes the black color. In this context, when the Hungarians had been subjected to the Onogurs and Khazars (White Ugrians), they had been called Black Ugrians (*Savarti*), and later, after their conquest, these denominations were used inside the Hungarians.²⁰ Also these colors and duality were interpreted as expressing a difference in military organization. The more noble right wing was defined as White Hungarians, while the less noble left wing was called Black Hungarians.²¹

Besides ethnic, political/territorial theories another hypothesis should be mentioned, namely, that colors could express religious duality. White may refer to Christians, while black to pagans.²² Our sources referred to the fact, that the Black Hungarians were pagans, Bruno tried to convert them and finally they were baptized by force. King Andrew I (1046–1060) was called by the chronicler of fourteenth-century chronicle composition “white and Catholic (*albus et catholicus*), while his younger brother Béla was described as “bald and brown-colored (*calvus et colore brunus*).²³

To interpret the sources that mention the White and Black Ugrians/Hungarians we should start with the reports of Bruno of Querfurt. He indeed went to the Black Hungarians, tried to convert them, but he was not successful, which he admitted. Later they were converted by force, which arouse ambivalent feelings in Bruno, he was happy about their conversion, but strongly disapproved the methods. It is important that in his reports he made no distinction between Black Hungarians and Hungarians. It is very probable, that the first legateship of Saint Peter, mentioned in Bruno’s letter, can be identified with the papal legate, Bishop Azo, who was present at the ordination of the bishopric of Pécs in August of 1009, and the conversion of Black Hungarians can be connected with the organization of the Catholic Church in Hungary.²⁴ It is quite evident, that the problem of White and Black Hungarians cannot be solved with the help of our first primary source, Bruno of Querfurt.

idem, *Levediától a Kárpát-medencéig*. [From Levedia to the Carpathian Basin] Szegedi Középtörténeti Könyvtár 14. Szeged 1998, 92–94.

²⁰ L. Klima, “Fehér és fekete. Duális társadalmi struktúrák a népvándorlás kori népeknél,” [White and Black. Dual Social Structures of Peoples in the Age of the Great Migration] *Hermann Ottó Múzeum Évkönyve* 30–32 (1987–1989), 115–126; idem, “Fehérvár, Fejéregyháza, Fehértemplom.” *Névtani Értesítő* 15 (1993), 185–191.

²¹ Gy. László, *A honfoglaló magyar nép élete*. [The Life of the Hungarian People in the Age of Conquest] Budapest 1944, (reprint 1988) 182–183, 202.

²² Tóth, “A fehér és fekete magyarok kérdéséhez,” 8; Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary under the Early Árpáds, 890s to 1063*. New York 2002, 99–100.

²³ SRH I: 344.

²⁴ For the organization of Hungarian church see L. Koszta, “A kereszténység kezdetei és az egyházzervezés Magyarországon.” [The Beginnings of Christianity and the Organization of Church in Hungary] in Gy. Kristó, ed., *Az államalapító*, Budapest, 1988, 183–186; Makk, *Magyar külpolitika*, 56.

Our next source, the chronicle of Ademar, gives more clues, but it is more debatable – considering the above mentioned debate whether there is an interpolation or not, and its authenticity – and difficult to interpret. First of all, Ademar had never been to Hungary. It is possible, that he connected two pieces of information, one about the Black Hungarians and their conversion, and the attack of King Stephen against an opposing chieftain, which was considered by foreign sources as a war between two lands, countries. It can be assumed, that the war of Saint Stephen against his uncle, the *gyula*, was reflected in the chronicle of Ademar as the war between White and Black Hungary.²⁵ Ademar reinforced the information of Bruno of Querfurt, that before their forceful conversion the Black Hungarians had been pagans. Ademar provided one additional, but doubtful piece of information that the Black Hungarians got their name because of their dark skin and consequently he named the “other” Hungary of Saint Stephen as White Hungary. The explanation of the contemporary chronicle may be true, but it was more likely a medieval *topos*. One may recall that the chronicle of Simon de Keza or the fourteenth-century chronicle composition mentioned that the skin of the inhabitants of *Scitia* – from where the Hungarians came according to these late Hungarian chronicles – is “rather dark, than fair”.²⁶ The anonymous writer of the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* remarked that the skin of the Hungarians was black.²⁷ Since the explanation of Ademar is more likely of a medieval *topos*, one should not regard the Black Hungarians as a population of darker skin, and consequently Muslims or Turkish/Qabar group.

The White and Black Ugrians of *The Russian Primary Chronicle*/PVL present a mystery as well. It is very probable, that the Ugrians and White Ugrians mentioned together with peoples and rulers of the seventh century were called Turks in the original sources, and could be Onogurs, Khazars or Bulgars. Later, in the tenth century the ethnonym of Turks denoted the Hungarians by the Byzantine chronicles, so their Slavic equivalent, the Ugrian was used in the PVL.²⁸ However, it is possible, that both of these denominations referred to the conquering Hungarian tribes.²⁹ The distinction of White and Black Ugrians can be explained as well with the construction process of *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, when several

²⁵ On the war of Saint Stephen against the regnum of Gyula (*Julus rex*) see, *Annales Altahenses* (taken from the *Annales Hildesheimenses*), Gombos, *Catalogus* I: 92; ÁKÍF, 238. (transl. by F. Makk).

²⁶ SRH I: 45, 252.

²⁷ *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis. Imperium Constantinopolitanum, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Ungaria, Polonia, Bohemia anno MCCCXIII. exarata*. Ed. O. Górká, Cracoviae 1916, 49.

²⁸ C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*. Cambridge 1930, 175; G. Vernadsky, M. Ferdinandy, *Studien zur ungarische Frühgeschichte. I. Lebedia. II. Álmos*. München 1957, 13; Ludat, *Farbenzeichnungen*, 143.

²⁹ Tóth, „A fehér és fekete magyarok kérdéséhez,” 4–5; idem, *Levediától a Kárpát-medencéig*, 92–93; Gy. Kristó, I. H. Tóth, “Az orosz évkönyvek néhány magyar vonatkozásáról.” [About Some Hungarian References in the Russian Primary Chronicles] *AUSz AH* 103 (1996), 26–27.

chroniclers worked on the original Byzantine material.³⁰ Since it is a debated source, we cannot define exactly, who were meant by the name of White and Black Ugrians. However, it should be noted, that the White Ugrians were mentioned earlier, and the Black Ugrians later.

An excellent contemporary work, namely *De administrando Imperio* (The Administration of Empire) of Emperor Constantine VII (944–959), containing a unique and comprehensive survey about the tenth century world and its past, may provide a solution to our problem.³¹ The Byzantine emperor uses the “white” denomination in case of two Slavic peoples, the Serbs and the Croats. He mentions that the “Serbs are descended from the unbaptized Serbs, also called white (*asprón*), who live beyond Turkey (i.e., Hungary – S. L. Tóth) in a place called by them Boiki.”³² Emperor Constantine differentiated between two kinds of Croats. According to him “the Croats at that time were dwelling beyond Bavaria, where the Belocroats [*Belokrobatoí* ~ White Croatians – S. L. Tóth] are now.”³³ Then he tells their story that one group of the Croats migrated and defeated the Avars of Dalmatia. “The rest of the Croats stayed over against *Francia* [sc. the Frankish Empire – S. L. Tóth] and are now called Belocroats, that is white Croats [*asproi Khróbatoí*], and have their own prince ...and are unbaptized, and intermarry and are friendly with the Turks [sc. the Hungarians of the Carpathian Basin – S. L. Tóth].”³⁴ Emperor Constantine also mentioned that “the Croats who now live in the region of Dalmatia are descended from the unbaptized Croats, also called ‘white’, who live beyond Turkey [Hungary] and next to *Francia* [Frank Empire] and have for Slav neighbours the unbaptized Serbs.”³⁵ And finally, the Byzantine emperor stated, that “Great Croatia [*megalé Khróbatia*], also called white [*aspré*], is still unbaptized to this day, as are also the Serbs who are its neighbors ... and are more regularly plundered by the Franks and Turks [sc. Hungarians] and Pechenegs.”³⁶ This information is repeated in the next chapter, “their neighbor ... is also Great Croatia [*megalé Khróbatia*], the unbaptized, also called ‘white’ [*aspré*].”³⁷ Summarizing these reports it is clear, that two kinds of Serbs and Croats were differentiated in the middle of the tenth century. The Serbs and Croats living in the Northwest and Northeast of Hungary (the Hungarian tribes of the Carpathian Basin) were called White Serbs and White Croats, while the emigrant, southern groups were just called Serbs and Croats. In the case of the northern,

³⁰ L. Balogh, “Megjegyzések a PVL fehér és fekete magyarjaihoz.” [Some Remarks on the White and Black Hungarians of PVL] *AUSz AH* 121 (2005), 34, 36–37, 45; idem, “The Ugric Allies of Heraclius,” *Chronica* 4 (2004), 8–14.

³¹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*. Greek text edited by Gy. Moravcsik, English translation by R. J. H. Jenkins. (henceforth: DAI), Washington DC 1967.

³² DAI 152–153 (32/2–4).

³³ DAI 142–143 (30/61–63).

³⁴ DAI 142–143 (30/71–75).

³⁵ DAI 146–147 (31/3–6).

³⁶ DAI 152–153 (31/83–87).

³⁷ DAI 152–153 (32/5–6).

white Croats, their territory is called Great Croatia as well, which referred not to the territorial extension, but to the original, earlier settlement. It is evident that the white denomination could not denote the Christian religion in this case, because both the northern Serbs and Croats were unbaptized pagans. In both cases those people were called white, who remained in their ancient homeland, also referred to as great, meaning old, original territory. At the same time Emperor Constantine did not mention another color in the cases of the emigrant, southern Serbs and Croats.³⁸ He used the "black" adjective in case of the Bulgars living in the east. It is mentioned that "the so-called Black Bulgaria [*mauré legomené Bulgaria*] can also attack the Chazars."³⁹ The emperor referred to "the Dnieper river, from which the Russians came through to Black Bulgaria and Chazaria and Syria."⁴⁰ Black Bulgars were also referred to in *The Russian Primary Chronicle*.⁴¹ The locality of these Bulgars is debatable. Some put it in the region of Kuban, others located it between the Dnieper and Don.⁴² Generally it is not accepted, that Black Bulgaria can be identified with the so-called Volga Bulgaria or Great Bulgaria.⁴³ Instead it is supposed that Volga Bulgaria was called White or Great Bulgaria.⁴⁴ Presently, we cannot say for sure, where the Black Bulgars lived, in the north or in the south. One thing is sure. It was not the original homeland of the Bulgarians, perhaps that is why their territory is called Black Bulgaria.

Our hypothesis based on DAI is that at least in the tenth century, and maybe earlier and in the next century as well, the white denomination could refer to one group of people remaining in their "great", older homeland, while the black adjective could denote the other group(s) of people migrating to a new homeland. Using this possible analogy we may suppose that White Hungary can be identified with Great or Greater Hungary (*Magna Hungaria* or *Ungaria Maior*), the ancient, original homeland of the Hungarian tribes, where clans and tribes lived next to river Volga, in the vicinity of the mentioned Volga Bulgars (Great Bulgaria). This group of Hungarians – in my assumption, the White Hungarians – may have been referred to by the Muslim geographers, Istakhri and Ibn Haukal, as well.⁴⁵ This ancient homeland, *Ungaria Maior* was visited by the Dominican Friar Julian in the thirteenth century (1236). In the Hungarian chronicle tradition it was held that from this original settlement (*Ungaria Maior*) the Hungarian tribal leaders migrated to their present homeland.⁴⁶ Julian not only found these pagan

³⁸ Ludat, *Farbenzeichnungen*, 45–46.

³⁹ DAI 64–65 (12/3).

⁴⁰ DAI 186–187 (42/77–78).

⁴¹ *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, 76.

⁴² R. J. H. Jenkins, ed., *Constantine Porphyrogenitus: De administrando imperio*. Vol. 2: *Commentary*. London 1962, (henceforth: *Commentary*) 62; Ludat, *Farbenzeichnungen*, 153.

⁴³ *Commentary*, 62; Ludat, *Farbenzeichnungen*, 153.

⁴⁴ Ludat, *Farbenzeichnungen*, 153.

⁴⁵ HKÍF, 49–51.

⁴⁶ "Inventum fuit in Gestis Ungarorum Christianorum, quid esset alia Ungaria maior, de qua septem duces cum populis suis egressi fuerant, ... tandem venerunt in terram, que nunc Ungaria dicitur," see the first voyage of Julian, and on this see the report of Riccardus," in *Relatio*

Hungarians living next to river Volga (*iuxta magnum flumen Ethyl*), but also spoke with them. These Hungarians of *Ungaria Maior* – Great Hungary and very probably White Hungary – also knew that the Christian Hungarians living somewhere in the west had been descended from them.⁴⁷

As far as the Black Hungarians are concerned, one has to refer once more to the fact that Bruno of Querfurt, who went to them to convert them, made no distinction between Hungarians and Black Hungarians. Besides, he only mentioned the conversion of Black Hungarians, and never said a word about White Hungarians. It is only Ademar, who made mention of White Hungary, without giving any further information about it. However, Ademar had never been to Hungary, and even in his description the greater emphasis is on the defeated Black Hungary with its black-skinned inhabitants and their full conversion. If we take the reports of *The Russian Primary Chronicle* for granted, the earlier, seventh-century reference is to the White Ugrians/Hungarians, while the later, ninth-century reference is to the Black Ugrians/Hungarians. According to these sources the Black Hungarians surely can be identified with the Hungarian tribes migrating from *Magna Ungaria* and finally conquering the Carpathian Basin and settling there. According to Emperor Constantine these Hungarians called by him Turks or *Sabartoi Asphaloi* (*Savartoi*), lived for a while in Lebedia/Levedia and Atelkouzou/Etelköz (territories between the rivers Don and Danube), before their conquest of their new homeland.⁴⁸ These conquering Black Hungarians were pagans, but they were converted during the first decade of the eleventh century due to the activity of Bruno and other missionaries and the struggle of the first Hungarian king, Saint Stephen, against his opponents.

It is possible that another group of Hungarians were also called Black Hungarians. Emperor Constantine reported that there was a Pecheneg attack and the Turks/Hungarians were defeated and split into two parts: "one part went eastwards and settled in the region of Persia, and to this day are called by the ancient denomination of the Turks 'Sabartoi asphaloi'."⁴⁹ Constantine also mentioned that there was a contact between these eastern Hungarians and the Hungarians "who live toward the western region" in his time as well.⁵⁰ In another work, entitled *De Cerimoniis*, Emperor Constantine stated that the meaning of *Sevorti* (*Sabartoi*) was "black boys" (*maura paidia*).⁵¹ This name (*Sevorti/Sabartoi*) can have the meaning Black Ugrians or Black Hungarians like in our sources (Bruno of Quer-

fratris Ricardi. Praefatus est, textum recensuit, annotationibus instruxit J. Deér, in SRH II: 535–536.

⁴⁷ "Sciunt enim per relationes antiquorum, quod isti Ungari ab ipsis descenderant; sed ubi essent, ignorabant." On the first voyage of Friar Julian on the Order of King Béla IV of Hungary (1235–1270), see the report of Riccardus in SRH II: 540; further see *Julianus barát és a Napkelet felfedezése*. [Friar Julian and the Discovery of the Orient] Selected and tr. Gy. Györfly and I. Gy. Ruitz, Budapest 1986, 68.

⁴⁸ DAI 170–175 (chapter 38).

⁴⁹ DAI 170–173. (38/26–29).

⁵⁰ DAI 172–175. (38/60–65).

⁵¹ *De Cerimoniis*. ed. J. J. von Reiske, Bonn 1829, 689; see Pritsak, *Orientierung*, 378.

furt, Ademarus, *The Russian Primary Chronicle*) and may refer to the same people migrating from their ancient homeland and the first group settling first in *Lebedia/Atelkouzou* and then in the Carpathian basin, and the other group settling in the east, „in the regions of Persia”, i. e., in the Caucasus, around the River Kura.⁵² So it seems very probable that at the end of the nineteenth century, the eminent historian, Henrik Marczali made a mistake, when he was of the opinion, that by the denomination of Black Ugrians Khazars and other eastern relatives were meant and the Black Ugrians/Hungarians could not live in Hungary.⁵³

In my opinion, just the Black Hungarians, the people of the seven tribes and the three tribes of joining Qabars of Khazar origin migrated to the Carpathian Basin, later called Hungary and to the Caucasus, while some other Hungarians, the White ones remained in their first, ancient homeland, *Ungaria Maior* (Great/Old Hungary) in the Volga region.

⁵² The *Savartoi asphaloi* can be identified with the Black Ugrians, see, Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*, 174–176; *Savartoi asphaloi* was interpreted as “lower” Black Ugric as contrasted with the upper Black Ugric, i. e. the rest of the Magyar nation, see J. Marquart, *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, 39.

⁵³ H. Marczali, „A vezérek kora és a királyság megalapítása,” [The Age of Chieftains and the Foundation of the Monarchy] in *A magyar nemzet története*, Vol. 1, ed. S. Szilágyi, Budapest 1895, 276.

The Turks in the Vita Sancti Athanasii Athonitae

Vardariota-Turks or Hungarians?*

LÁSZLÓ BALOGH



The biography of Athanasios Athonita – founder of the Great Lavra Monaster on Mount Athos – mentions some monks from Mount Athos who wanted to lodge a complaint against Athanasios to Byzantine emperor Basil II (976–1025). On their way to see the emperor, however, somewhere in the vicinity of Thessaloniki, they were taken captive by the *Turks* (Τούρκοι). According to the source, the Turks, who were allies of the emperor at this time, robbed and undressed the monks, and then let them go free.¹

Researchers have identified these Turks with one of two ethnic groups at various times: either Hungarians from the Carpathian Basin (who were referred to as *Turks* by several Byzantine authors in the tenth and eleventh centuries)² or the Vardar Turks living north of Thessaloniki by the Vardar river.³ Additionally, according to several researchers, the Vardar Turks were a group of Hungarians who moved from the Carpathian Basin to the Balkans and settled in the Byzan-

* I am indebted for the professional assistance provided by Profs. Teréz Olajos and Ferenc Makk.

¹ *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae*, ed. J. Noret, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 9, Brepols–Turnhout 1982, A 210₁₋₂₉, 211₁₋₂₈, B 58₁₋₅₃. cf. *La Vie de Saint Athanase l'Athonite*. Chevetogne, 1963, 77–79; Gy. Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai* [The Byzantine sources related to Árpadian Hungarian History] Budapest 1988², 74–77.

² P. Váczy, Gyula és Ajtony [Gyula and Ajtony] in *Emlékkönyv Szentpétery Imre születése hatvanadik évfordulójának ünnepére*, Budapest 1938, 506, Note 77; Хр. Димитров, *Българо-унгарски отношения през средновековието*, София 1998, 82, 358. cf. Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II. Zweite durchgearbeitete Auflage. Berlin 1958, 321–322.

³ В. Търкова-Займова, “Житие на Атанасий Атонски,” in *Гръцки извори за българската история*. VI. ed. И. Дуйчев et al. *Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae* 10. София [no year] 9, Note 4; N. Oikonomidès, « Vardariotes-W.l.nd.r-V.n.nd.r: Hongrois installés dans la vallée du Vardar en 934, » *Südost-Forschungen* 32 (1973), 2, Note 7.

tine Empire.⁴ In his compiled volume of Byzantine sources regarding Hungarian history, Gyula Moravcsik included this source as well but noted that he could not decide whether the *Turks* mentioned here were really Hungarians or not.⁵ Researchers also disagree on whether the events mentioned occurred in the 990s⁶ or around 1000–1001.⁷

Saint Athanasios's biography contains a number of details in connection with the *Turks* attacking the monks which can clarify their identity. The source contains the following:

"... [the *Turks* are the] allies of the great emperor, whose spears are so much feared that they accepted the peace (which they did not favor) out of fear."⁸

This passage, then, notes that the *Turks* are not enemy people due to their fear of the Byzantine army but allies of the emperor, who keep to the peace treaty signed with the Empire.⁹ At a later point the source also notes that they are not violators of contract. Byzantine diplomacy regulated its relationship with states

⁴ Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, Budapest 1970, 59–60; Oikonomidès, *Vardariotes*, 1–8; Gy. Györffy István király és műve. [King Stephen and his work] Budapest 1977, 55; Gy. Györffy, "A 942. évi magyar vezérnévsor kérdéséhez," [The questions of 942nd Hungarian leader-list] *Magyar Nyelv* 76 (1980), 313; Gy. Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől Szent István államáig*. [From the tribal confederation of Levedi to the state of Saint Stephen] Budapest 1980, 105–106; Gy. Györffy, "A kalandozások kora," [The age of the conquests] in *Magyarország története. Előzmények és magyar történet 1242-ig*. ed. Gy. Székely, Budapest 1987, 676–678; Gy. Györffy, *Anonymus. Rejtély avagy történeti forrás?* [Anonymus. Mystery or historical source?] Budapest 1988, 21–22; Gy. Györffy, *Krónikáink és a magyar őstörténet. Régi kérdések – új válaszok*. [Hungarian chronicles and Hungarian proto-history. New answers to old questions] Budapest 1993, 33; Gy. Kristó–F. Makk, *A kilencedik és a tizedik század története*. [The history of the 9th and 10th centuries] Budapest 2001, 143. cf. I. Kapitány, "Vardarióták," [Vardariots] in *Korai magyar történeti lexikon* (9–14. század). ed. Gy. Kristó. Budapest 1994, 713.

⁵ Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 75, Note 7. cf. Gy. Moravcsik, *A magyar történet bizánci forrásai*. [The byzantine sources of the Hungarian History] A Magyar Történettudomány Kézikönyve I. kötet 6/b. füzet Budapest 1934, 141; Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, 59; Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* I. 555. M. Gyóni, *Magyarország és a magyarság a bizánci források tükrében*. [Hungary and the Hungarians in the mirror of the byzantine sources] Magyar–görög Tanulmányok 7. Budapest 1938, 49; P. Charanis, "The Transfer of Population as a Polity in the Byzantine Empire," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3 (1961), 148.

⁶ Moravcsik, *A magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 141; P. Lemerle–A. Guillou–N. Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra*. I. Archives de l'Athos 5, Paris 1970, 46–47; Oikonomidès, *Vardariotes*, 2, Note 7.

⁷ Димитров, *Българо-унгарски отношения*, 82, 358.

⁸ *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae* A 211⁵⁻⁷. cf. B 58⁴⁰⁻⁴⁴.

⁹ *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae* A 211⁵⁻⁷. cf. B 58⁴⁰⁻⁴⁴, A 211⁹.

and peoples it had contact with in a very refined way.¹⁰ The expressions for *peace treaty* and *allies* found in the source in question can only refer to a state or people independent of the Empire but loyal to it.¹¹ The Vardar Turks lived within the Empire and were subjects of the emperor: they were not allies of the emperor, and he could not sign a peace treaty with them; subjects were given orders by the emperor and they carried them out.

One of the key issues of Byzantine foreign relations in the tenth century was the defense of the East-European section of the empire's border. The usual practice in such cases had been, for centuries, to win over barbarian peoples living in the border areas to become allies.¹² A part of the contract with them would have been the granting of Byzantine court titles to the barbarian ruler, the conversion of the rulers to Christianity, and an annual sending of gifts (partly in coins) by the emperor. In return, the rulers guaranteed that their people would not attack the Empire but, if necessary, defend it.¹³ Depending on whether a given people or

¹⁰ Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, 54; L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin*. Paris 1970, 229–233. cf. I. I. Reiske, *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo*. I. Bonnae 1829, 686–692.

¹¹ „... and that the position within the *Oikoumene* of these satellites, theoretically subject to the Emperor, independent in practice...” D. Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” in *Actes XIIe Congres International d'Etudes byzantines*. I. Belgrade 1964, 58. cf. 56–58; D. A. Miller, “Byzantine treaties and treaty-making: 500–1025 AD,” *Byzantinoslavica* 32 (1971), 57; D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*. New York–Washington 1971, 200. On the Byzantine diplomacy cf. Obolensky, *The Principles and Methods*, 45–61; F. Dölger–J. Karayannopoulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, Vol 1., München 1969, 89–107; J. Shepard, “Messages, ordres et ambassades: diplomatie centrale et frontalière à Byzance (IX^e–XI^e siècles),” in *Voyages et voyageurs à Byzance et en occident du VI^e au XI^e siècles*, éd. par A. Dierkens et J.-M. Sansterre, Geneve 2000, 375–396; Bréhier, *Les institutions*, 229–262; *Byzantine Diplomacy*. ed. J. Shepard–S. Franklin, Aldershot 1992.

¹² Cf. D. Obolensky, “The Empire and its Northern Neighbours, 565–1018,” in *The Cambridge Medieval History*. IV, I. Cambridge 1966, 473–518; F. E. Wozniak, “Byzantium, the Pechenegs and the Rus’: The Limitations of a Great Power’s Influence on its Clients in the 10th Century Eurasian Steppe,” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 4 (1984) 299–316; Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, 163–201.

¹³ Miller, *Byzantine treaties*, 59–66; R. Scott, “Diplomacy in the sixth century the evidence of John Malalas,” in *Byzantine Diplomacy*. ed. J. Shepard–S. Franklin, Aldershot 1992, 162–163, 165. cf. Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De administrando imperio*. Greek text edited by Gy. Moravcsik. English translation by R. J. H. Jenkins *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 1. Washington 1967, 48–57 (1–8. caput); *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. tr. E. Jeffreys–M. Jeffreys–R. Scott, Melbourne 1986, 233–234, 247, 249–250; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 85–86; *Повесть временных лет*, I. Текст и перевод. Подготовка текста Д. С. Лихачева перевод Д. С. Лихачева и Б. А. Романова, Москва–Ленинград 1950, 28, 38, 52.

The gifts given during the contract: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio* 52–53 (6. caput); *Повесть временных лет* 29, 34, 44, 50–51. cf. A. V. Marey, “Socio-political Structure of the Pecheneg,” in *Alternatives of Social Evolution*, ed. N. N. Kradin et alii. Vladivostok 2000, 290.

ruler were able to loosen their ties to the Empire (or, on the contrary, tighten them), Byzantine diplomacy used different expressions to refer to them. Foreign states and peoples often sent troops or mercenaries to the Byzantine Empire as part of the contract or treaty.¹⁴

A Byzantine author, Prokopios mentions the agreement between the Ostrogoth ruler Theodatus and the Byzantine Empire. According to it, the Ostrogoths were to send 3,000 troops if Justinian I (527–565) sends a request.¹⁵ Byzantine emperor Heracleius (610–641) strengthened his army with Khazar troops around 627 (the Khazars lived under the rule of Turks at the time, and Heracleius signed a treaty with the western Turks).¹⁶ In 987 Vladimir ruler of Kievan Rus sent 6,000 troops to the Byzantine Empire in aid to emperor Basil II to aid his struggle against pretenders attacking his throne.¹⁷ In the 1150s according to the contract between Byzantine emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180) and the ruler of the Raška state, 2,000 Serbian troops had to be provided to the Byzantine army for European wars, and 500 for Asian wars.¹⁸ Many more examples could be given. Sources mention that in the eleventh century soldiers of Rus, Varg, English, Frankish, German, Bulgarian, Saracen, Alan, Abazg etc. background fought in the Byzantine army.¹⁹ On the basis of the expressions referring to the relationship of the *Turks* to the Byzantine Empire as well as the general practices of Byzantine

¹⁴ Miller, *Byzantine treaties*, 62–64; Bréhier, *Les institutions*, 239, 273, 286–287, 297–298.

¹⁵ Procopius, *History of the Wars*. Gothic War, Book V & VI. tr. H. B. Dewing, New York 2007, 48–49 (V. vi. 2.); Miller, *Byzantine treaties*, 63.

¹⁶ K. Czeglédy, "Herakleios török szövetségesei," [Heraclius's the turkish allies] *Magyar Nyelv* 49 (1953) 319–323; D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton 1954, 28–33; P. B. Golden, *Khazar Studies. An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. I. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 25/1. Budapest 1980, 51, 218–219; M. Bíró, "Georgian Sources on the Caucasian Campaign of Heracleios," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 35 (1981) 121–132; D. Sinor, "The establishment and dissolution of the Türk empire," in *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. ed. D. Sinor, Cambridge 1990, 308–309; M. Dobrovits, "Herakleios nomád szövetségeseiről," [Heraclius's the nomad allies] in *Fegyveres nomádok, nomád fegyverek*, ed. L. Balogh–L. Keller, Magyar Östörténeti Könyvtár 21. Budapest 2004, 38–44.

¹⁷ *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers*. The Chronographia of Michael Psellus, tr. E. R. A. Sewter, Harmondsworth 1966, 34–35; G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Staates*. München 1963, 252; Louis Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance*, Paris 1969, 185; P. Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*. Cambridge 2002, 60.

¹⁸ Bréhier, *Les institutions*, 239.

¹⁹ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*, Vol. 5, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1844, 53; Lemerle–Guillou–Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra* 258, 243; V. R. Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca. Izvlečenija iz Letopisi Jaxi Antioxijskago*, Sanktpeterburg 1883 (reprint London 1972), 32, 40. cf. 312–333, Note 272; C. Neumann, "Über zwei unerklärte Völkernamen in der byzantinischen Armee (Kulpinger und Talmatzer)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 3 (1894), 374–375; T. Olajos, "Contingent hongrois au service de Byzance en Italie," in *Les hongrois et l'Europe: conquête et intégration*. Textes réunis par S. Csernus et K. Korompay, Paris–Szeged 1999, 223–229; D. Smythe, "Why do barbarians stand round the emperor at diplomatic receptions?" in *Byzantine Diplomacy*. ed. J. Shepard–S. Franklin, Aldershot 1992, 315–312.

diplomacy we can, then, conclude that the *Turks* mentioned by the source were troops sent in accordance with a peace treaty between emperor Basil II and a power allied to him. They came from an ethnic group who, according to the author of the source, were previously an enemy and were forced into an alliance with the Empire only out of fear of the military might ("the spears") of the emperor.²⁰

The only questions left to answer are when the alliance of the *Turks* and Basil II can be dated to, and what *Turks* were allied to the emperor?

In dating the events we are helped by the source mentioning that the monks' journey took place when emperor Basil II "was resting his army in Macedonia during the preparation for the war against the Barbarians [i.e. the Bulgarians]".²¹ Basil II started the war against the Bulgarians in 991. A Byzantine author, Joannes Skylitzes, writes that, having been freed of the civil war waged by Bardas Skleros and Bardas Phokas, the emperor "inspected the preparations" for the war against the Bulgarians. In the course of this, the emperor traveled through the regions of Thrace and Macedonia and went to Thessaloniki, where he prayed at the altar of Saint Demetrios.²² After this, Byzantine troops waged a successful, several years long campaign against the Bulgarians, which Basil II had to suspend only because of the offensive started in the east by the Fatimid Caliphate. In 994, after the army of the emir of Damascus Banġu-tegin defeated the troops of the Byzantine commander of Antioch and his allies, the Muslim troops started an offensive on Aleppo, whose emir had previously accepted subordination to the Byzantine Empire. At this time the emperor personally started out from near Thessaloniki to the eastern front, arriving in Antioch in April or May 995. The unexpected Byzantine troops did not only exempt Aleppo but also extended the Byzantine control over Syria and the Southern Caucasus.²³ The emperor did not personally enter in-

²⁰ Symbolic importance of the spear of the Byzantine Emperor: M. Gyóni, *A paristrion 'államkultok' etnikai jellege*. [The nature of ethnicity of „states” of Paristrion] Budapest 1942, 10. cf. Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 126; Bréhier, *Les institutions*, 51.

²¹ *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae* A 210₁₋₄. cf. B 58₁₄₋₁₇; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 74. cf. 76; В. Тъпкова-Заимова, Сведения за българите в житието на св. Атанасий. in *Изследвания в чест на Акад. Димитър Дечев по случай 80-годишнината му*. София 1958, 759–761.

²² Ioannis Scylitzae, *Synopsis historiarum*, rec. Io. Thurn, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 5. Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1973, 339; Jean Skylitzes, *Empereurs de Constantinople*. tr. B. Flusin et annoté par J.–Cl. Cheynet, *Réalités Byzantines* 8. Paris 2003, 283; Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojsa* 27, 29–42, 227; Г. Цанкова-Петкова, Похвално слово за Фотий Тесалийски. in *Гръцки извори за българската история*. V. *Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae* 9. София 1964, 315. cf. 315, Note 4; cf. St. Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, London 1930, 227–228; Ст. Ангелџак, *Самуиловата държава*, Скопје 1969, 44; M. Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1996, 377; Д. Ангелов–Б. Чолпанов *Българска военна история от втората четвърт на X до втората половина на XV в.* София 1998, 40–41.

²³ Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojsa*, 32–42; E. Honigmann, *Die ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches*. Bruxelles 1935, 105–108; Ангелов–Чолпанов, *Българска военна история*, 42; Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte de byzantinischen Staates*, 255–256.

to fighting in the Balkans until 1001, at which time, returning from the eastern front, his troops first started an offensive in the direction of Philippopolis, then destroyed several fortifications in the vicinity of Serdika (Triaditza), finally retreating to Mosynopolis, where the emperor most likely spent the winter. In 1001–1002, still attacking the eastern Bulgarian territories, the Byzantine troops took Small and Great Preslav and Pliska. At this point the emperor did not join his troops but returned to Constantinople.²⁴ The monks' journey could not have taken place after this time, since Athanasios died on July 5, 1002.²⁵ It seems probable then that in 1001–1002 Byzantine troops as well as, for some time, the emperor himself were in Eastern Bulgaria, a place that the monks would have had to reach to present their grievances by crossing territories controlled by the Bulgarians – an unlikely scenario. The source mentions that one of the group of monks was Joannes Phakenos, the superior, the *protos* of the monastery.²⁶ It is known that he held this position in 991 and 996, but in 1001 the position was already held by the successor of his successor and not him.²⁷ Thus, it cannot have been in 1001–1002 that the monks made their journey to emperor Basil II, who was already fighting in other parts of the Balkans by then, and one of Athanasios's adversaries, Joannes Phakenos, was already dead.

Because of the dangers of such a trip, Athanasios warned the monks plotting against him from going to see the emperor. They, however, answered that they would take the journey by land rather than by sea, and since traveling by land was safe, they would not be subjected to danger – they argued.²⁸ Shortly before 993 a Muslim fleet of pirates was plundering around Thessaloniki. A Byzantine charter dated September 993 mentions that a group of Serbs and a monk called Kosmas were captured by the pirates on their way to Basil II. The emperor paid ransom and had them freed.²⁹ Athanasios's biography remarks that when the

²⁴ Ioannis Scylitzae, 343; Jean Skylitzes, *Empereurs de Constantinople*, 287; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 89–90; Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca*, 42; Ангелов-Чолпанов, *Българска военна история*, 42–43.

²⁵ P. Lemerle, "La vie ancienne de Saint Athanase l'Athonite composée au début du XI^e siècle par Athanase de Lavra," in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos (963–1963)*. Études et Mélanges I. Wetteren 1963, 96–97; Димитров, *Българо-унгарски отношения*, 82. Other researchers an even earlier date on any unthinkable cf. A. Kazhdan–N. Patterson Ševčenko, "Athanasios of Athos," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. I. ed. in chief: A. P. Kazhdan, New York–Oxford 1991, 1219; *Byzantine Monastic Foundation documents*. I. ed. J. Thomas–A. Constantinides Hero, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 35. Washington 2000, 210.

²⁶ *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae* A 209₁₂, B 58₈.

²⁷ J. Darrouzes, Liste des prôtes de l'Athos. in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos (963–1963)*. Études et Mélanges I. Wetteren 1963, 410. cf. Lemerle–Guillou–Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra* 118–122, 130–133.

²⁸ *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae* A 210₂₇; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 75.

²⁹ Lemerle–Guillou–Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra* 122–125; G. Ostrogorsky, "Une ambassade serbe aupres de l'empereur Basile II." *Byzantion* 19 (1949), 187–189; J. V. A. Jr. Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann

monks went to the emperor, "they found themselves in unexpected danger, which was no smaller than if they had gone by sea, even though they went by land." Perhaps the monks were afraid of the Muslim pirates when they opted for the land route.³⁰ But they were not spared, being robbed by Turks instead.

So, it could have been only between 991 and 994 that the monks had gone to see emperor Basil II nearby Thessaloniki. Who were then the Turks who were allied with the Byzantine Empire at this time?

The emperor strove to provide a diplomatic foundation for his war against Bulgarians. In 992 he decreased the tax on Venetian merchants (whom he considered his subjects) in a Golden Bull.³¹ Before 993 Serbian ruler Joannes Vladimir's envoys came to see the emperor, and the emperor established an alliance with them.³² The ruler of Kievan Rus, Vladimir, was an ally of the Byzantine Empire beginning with 987.³³ The Croatian ruler, Stephan Držislav received regalia and the title of *patrikios* from emperor Basil II, and trusted to him as an eparch in the defense of Dalmatian towns.³⁴ As we can see, before the attack on Bulgarians, the emperor strove to win the states and peoples of the Eastern European region over to his plan. Perhaps, an alliance with the *Turks* was a part of this process as well. The Turks may have been a people with whom the Byzantine Empire made a peace treaty. The source I am discussing, however, also claims that the *Turks* had been enemies of the Byzantine Empire before, and only the "emperor's spears", i.e. the threat of the Byzantine troops forced them to accept peace.

In the army of the emir of Damascus, Banġu-tegin, there were Turkic troops, made up of soldiers of Central Asian origin.³⁵ They would not have been considered by any Byzantine author as a power with whom the Byzantine emperor entered into a peace treaty. In addition, between 991 and 994 the emir of Damascus was an enemy rather than an ally of Basil II.³⁶ It seems then that along the eastern borders of the Byzantine Empire there was no independent *Turk* power whom Byzantine authors would have considered a sovereign political factor and who could have provided Basil II with *Turk* troops.

However, tenth century Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin would have fit the description fully. Patriarch of Constantinople Nikolaos Mystikos referred to Hungarians in a letter dated before 914 as a people that the Byzantine leadership

Arbor 1989⁵, 193–194; Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte de byzantinischen Staates*, 255; P. Stephenson, *The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer*, London 2003, 17.

³⁰ Cf. Lemerle-Guillou-Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra*, 123. cf. Lemerle-Guillou-Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra*, 124.

³¹ F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*. I. München-Berlin 1924, 100 (781. No.); Bréhier, *Les institutions*, 245; D. M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice. A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*. London 1988, 40–42.

³² Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans*, 193–194.

³³ Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte de byzantinischen Staates*, 252.

³⁴ N. Klaić, *Povijest hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 1971, 323; Ostrogorsky, *Une ambassade serbe*, 190; Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans*, 274.

³⁵ Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca*, 29–31.

³⁶ Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca*, 36–42. cf. 304, Note 243.

gives gifts to in order to gain their military support.³⁷ In another letter dated in 924–925 he mentions Hungarians among other peoples – the Pechenegs, the Rus, the Alans, and other *Scyths* – as ready to attack together the Bulgarians at the “emperor’s urging” and in the interests of the Byzantine Empire.³⁸ According to a Byzantine source, *Georgius Monachus Continuatus*, in 943 an attack by raiding Hungarians could only be warded off by the Byzantine court by signing a peace treaty with them. Also according to the source, this peace treaty was respected by the Hungarians for five years.³⁹ Joannes Skylitzes mentioned that a Hungarian leader, Bulcsu converted to Christianity in Constantinople, probably in 948, received the title of *patrikios* and a sizeable sum of money, but even so he broke the treaty signed with God and attacked the Byzantine Empire several times.⁴⁰ In the middle of the tenth century, Byzantine Emperor Constantinos Porphyrogennetos and his son and co-emperor, Rómanos, sent a letter (and not an emperor’s order⁴¹) to the leaders of the Hungarians,⁴² which is indicative of them being treated, together with the Pechenegs and the Rus, among those eastern European peoples who were independent of the Empire due to their military power.⁴³

It seems then that in the biography the relationship of the *Turks* with the Empire is exactly of the kind that sources describe tenth century Hungarian-Byzantine relations to be like. The Hungarians were one of those people who were independent of the Empire due to their military power, but they were ready to fight on its side if this was requested. This had not, however, been always the case. Undoubtedly, the source’s reference to earlier attacks of the *Turks* fit the Hungarians’ several military campaigns carried out during the course of the tenth century.⁴⁴

³⁷ *Nicolas I Patriarch Constantinople. Letters.* Greek text and English translation: R. J. H. Jenkins–L. G. Westerink, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 6. Washington 1973, 514–515 (183. letter); Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 26.

³⁸ *Nicolas I Patriarch Constantinople. Letters* 160–161 (Letter 23); Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 24–26.

³⁹ *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus.* Ex recognitione Immanuelis Bekkeri, Bonnae 1838, 917^{6–10}; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 61–62, 65. cf. 68–70.

⁴⁰ Ioannis Scylitzae 239^{59–76}; Jean Skylitzes, *Empereurs de Constantinople* 202; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 85–86, 100. cf. Gy. Moravcsik, “Görögnyelvű monostorok Szent István korában,” [Greek monasteries in St. Stephen’s age] in *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*, Vol 1. ed. J. Serédi, Budapest 1938, 391–399.

⁴¹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio* 56–57 (8. captu); Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 36.

⁴² *De cerimoniis* 691^{3–4}; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 34.

⁴³ *De cerimoniis* 690^{21–691}.

⁴⁴ Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, 54–61; Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől*, 268–271, 277, 280, 293–307; Gy. Györffy, “Államszervezés,” in *Magyarország története. Előzmények és magyar történet 1242-ig*. ed. Gy. Székely, Budapest 1987², 670–672, 675, 681–684; P. T. Antonopoulos, “Byzantium, the Magyar Raids and Their Consequences,” *Byzantinoslavica* 54 (1993), 254–267; L. Balogh, A New Source on the Hungarian Raid against By-

Researchers have long supposed that, following their defeat at Arcadiopolis in 970, the Hungarians felt threatened by the territorial gains of the Byzantine Empire in the Balkans.⁴⁵ Contrary to this opinion, Hungarian researcher István Bóna pointed out that such a theory lacks direct support in existing sources and has been of the opinion that such a Byzantine threat did not exist.⁴⁶ Bóna's opinion can no longer be held up. Relying on a passage by Joannes Skylitzes unnoticed by Hungarian scholars until recently, Ferenc Makk has called attention to the fact that in 971 Hungarians were afraid of the Byzantine military forces advancing victoriously through the Balkans.⁴⁷ It also needs to be pointed out that it is almost

zantium in the Middle of the Tenth Century," *Chronica* 7–8 (2007–2008), 16–25. Can hardly be mere coincidence that an unknown Byzantine author of the 10th second half century Byzantine military manual mentions the need for spies to be sent to the Hungarian Principality (*Three Byzantine Military Treatises*. Text, tr. G. T. Dennis. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 25. Washington 1985, 292–293; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 73).

⁴⁵ B. Hóman, "Szent István király," [St. Stephen king] in *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*, Vol. 2, ed. J. Serédi, Budapest 1938, 7; Györffy, *István király és műve*, 68; Györffy, *Államszervezés*, 727; I. Pirigyi, "A bizánci szertartású kereszténység helyzete Magyarországon Szent István korában," [The byzantine christianity in Hungary in the St. Stephen's age] in *Szent István és kora*, ed. F. Glatz–J. Kardos, Budapest 1988, 161–162; Gy. Györffy, *Államalapító apa és fia*. [Homeless father and his son] Bukarest–Kolozsvár 1997, 20–21; F. Makk, "A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig. A korai magyar-bizánci kapcsolatok," [From the bird Turul to the double-cross. The early Hungarian-Byzantine relations] in F. Makk, *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig*, Szeged 1998, 222–223; F. Makk, Magyar-bolgár kapcsolatok Géza nagyfejedelem és Szent István király korában [Hungarian-Bulgarian relations in the prince Géza and St. Stephen king's age] in F. Makk, *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig*, Szeged 1998, 118–119; M. Töser, "Az arkadiopolisi csata – Az utolsó kalandozó hadjárat, 970," [The battle of Arcadiopolis. The end of the hungarian campaign, 970] *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 117 (2004), 606–608.

⁴⁶ I. Bóna, *A magyarok és Európa a 9–10. században*. [The Hungarians and Europe in the 9–10th century] História Könyvtár Monográfiák 12. Budapest 2000, 66–71.

⁴⁷ F. Makk, "Új forrásadatok a X. század végi magyar-bizánci kapcsolatok értékeléséhez," [New sources on the hungarian-byzantine relationship in the 10th century] *A Nyíregyházi Jósza András Múzeum Évkönyve* 43 (2001), 271–274; F. Makk, "A bizánci fenyegetés árnyékában. Géza fejedelem politikai-vallási választása," [In the shadow of the Byzantine threat. The political-religious choice of prince Géza] *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 114 (2001), 130–138. cf. Димитров, *Българо-унгарски отношения*, 80, 358. Of course it is possible that cessation of activity hostile to the Byzantium Empire by the leadership of the Hungarian leaders have also changed the byzantine gifts (M. Töser, "A 971. évi dorostolori hadjárat," [The campaign of Dorostolon in 971] *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 115 (2002), 348). Surviving strategos of city Morava, Adralesios Diogenés protospatharios's the seal after 971 (*Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art*. I. ed. J. Nesbitt–N. Oikonomidès, Washington 1991, 195–196; Makk, *Új forrásadatok*, 272; Makk, *A bizánci fenyegetés árnyékában*, 134). Since strategos of Morava not included in the Escorial-Tacticon (*Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles*. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire par N. Oikonomidès, Paris 1972, 255–277), Nesbitt and Oikonomidès believed that creation of this post may not be

impossible to imagine that the leaders of the Hungarians would have underrated the military genius of Byzantine Emperor Joannes Tzimisces (969–976). The Byzantine emperor defeated the Bulgarian Czar, annexed its territories, took the Bulgarian Czar to Constantinople and made him abdicate; he broke the military might of Rus leader Svjatoslav and prevented him from seizing power over the northern and western shores of the Black Sea; and perhaps it was at his orders (or at least in a way favorable for him) that Pechenegs killed the Rus leader on his way back home to Kiev. If we also consider the fact that joint emperor Otto II married a relative of Joannes Tzimisces, we have to conclude that it is a fully absurd supposition that these processes did not affect the foreign relations of Hungarian leaders.⁴⁸ And if at the time of Joannes Tzimisces's campaign against the Bulgarians the leaders of the Hungarians were afraid of the proximity of the troops of the Byzantine Empire, like Joannes Skylitzes states they were,⁴⁹ then it is reasonable to suppose that at the time of Basil II's military campaign against the Bulgarians, Hungarians would have been forced to change their adversarial policy against the Byzantine Empire out of fear – since the campaign again attempted, successfully, to move the borders of the Empire up to the outer edges of the Carpathian Basin.

There are several examples of Hungarian troops fighting as part of the Byzantine army during the tenth and eleventh centuries. A troop of *Turks* sent as a part of the Byzantine army to Italy in 935 were supposed by scholars to be composed of Hungarians.⁵⁰ According to a Muslim source, the Byzantine troops fighting by the northern Syrian town of Hadat in 954 had *Turks*, i.e. Hungarians, along with Rus, Bulgarian, and Khazar soldiers.⁵¹ Byzantine Emperor Nikephoros Phokas took along Hungarian guards with him on a military campaign to Asia Minor.⁵² The troops of Hungarian king Stephen I were part of the Byzantine army fighting

expected before the completion of this work. On this basis, they was thought that between 975 and 986 the western regions of the Bulgarian Empire (or at least a portion thereof) came under byzantine control (*Catalogue of Byzantine Seals*, 100–101, 195–196). Thus, the Byzantine Empire will become the Hungarian Principality bordering (Makk, *Új forrásadatok*, 272–273; Makk, *A bizánci fenyegetés árnyékában*, 134; Tóser, *Az arkadiopolisi csata*, 606, Note 45).

⁴⁸ Cf. Makk, *A bizánci fenyegetés árnyékában*, 134–137. Jóannēs Tzimiskēs's reign see Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance*, 166–178; Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte de byzantinischen Staates*, 243–247.

⁴⁹ Ioannis Scylitzae 305^{21–22}; Jean Skylitzes, *Empereurs de Constantinople* 255; Makk, *Új forrásadatok*, 271; Makk, *A bizánci fenyegetés árnyékában*, 135.

⁵⁰ *De cerimoniis* 661^{4–5}; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, 34.

⁵¹ al-Dahabī, Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Uṣmān *Ta'rīh al-islām wa-wafiyāt al-mašāhīr wa-l-a'lām*. Beyrut 1994, 217; A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les arabes*. II. Bruxelles 1950, 243–244; Miller, *Byzantine treaties*, 62, Note 17. cf. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les arabes* 161, 331; M. Canard, "Mutanabbi et la guerre byzantino-arabe. Intérêt historique de ses poésies," in *Al-Mutanabbi*, Mémoires de l'Institut français de Damas, Beyrouth 1936, 105.

⁵² Liudprand, "Die Legatio," in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis separatim editi*, Hannoverae-Lipsiae 1915, 199.

the Bulgarians soon after the turn of the millennium.⁵³ Basil II's troops sent to Italy before 1025 also had *Turks* among them – scholars believe them to be Hungarians.⁵⁴

The most likely conclusion, then, is that the part of the biography under investigation relates the story of monks on their way to Byzantine emperor Basil II, planning a military campaign against the Bulgarians between 991 and 994, which monks were then robbed by a troop of Hungarians fighting as part of the Byzantine army. If this interpretation of the source is correct, we can state that between 991 and 994 Basil II had a Hungarian leader for an ally whose lands were within reach of the attacking Byzantine troops. Feeling threatened by the Byzantine expansion ("the spears of the emperor"), this Hungarian leader did not only enter into an alliance with Basil II,⁵⁵ but he also supported the emperor's campaign against the Bulgarians by contributing troops.

⁵³ O. Holder-Egger, "Fundatio ecclesiae S. Albani Namucensis," in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum XV/2*. Hannoverae 1888 (reprint: Stuttgart-New York 1963) 963–964; F. Makk, "Szent István és Bulgária [Saint Stephen and Bulgaria] *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica Különszám* 1991, 4–7; F. Makk, "Magyar-bolgár kapcsolatok Géza nagyfejedelem és Szent István király korában," [The hungarian-byzantine relationship in Géza and Saint Stephen's age] in F. Makk, *A tululmadártól a kettőskeresztig*, Szeged 1998, 120–125; F. Ferenc, "Une époque décisive: la Hongrie au milieu du XI^e siècle," in *Les hongrois et l'Europe: conquête et intégration. Textes réunis par S. Csernus et K. Korompay*, Paris-Szeged 1999, 314–315.

⁵⁴ Olajos, *Contingent hongrois*, 227–229.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, Vol. 2. ed. E. Szentpétery, Budapest 1938, 379, 381.

*Identität und Fremdheitsvorstellungen in der früheren ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung und deren europäische Beziehungen**

MIKLÓS HALMÁGYI



Wo aus einer Menschenmenge Volk und Nation gemacht werden sollen, spielen die gemeinsame Vergangenheit und das Bewusstsein einer gemeinsamen Abstammung eine tragende Rolle. Sowohl bei den ungarischen als auch bei anderen europäischen Geschichtsschreibern kann man Erzählungen finden, mit denen sie für ihr Volk Identität stifteten. Alheydis Plassman hat über mittelalterliche Abstammungsgeschichten ein aufschlussreiches Buch geschrieben, ungarische Werke hat sie aber nicht untersucht.¹ Auf der Grundlage der Ergebnisse Plassmanns werde ich prüfen, welche Ähnlichkeiten es zwischen den Werken der ungarischen Autoren und jenen anderer europäischer Geschichtsschreiber gibt, wenn es darum geht, ihren Völkern eine Identität zu verleihen. Im zweiten Teil der Arbeit werde ich untersuchen, wie sich die christlichen Autoren zu der heidnischen Vergangenheit ihres Volkes verhalten haben.

* Dieser Aufsatz ist die deutsche Version eines Vortrags, vorgetragen auf Ungarisch auf der Konferenz der Doktoranden organisiert von der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Hungarologie (Nemzetközi Magyarágtudományi Társaság) am 21. August 2008. (Ungarische Versionen: *Önazonosság és idegenfelfogás a korai magyar történetírásban és ennek európai összefüggései*; in *A magyarágtudományok önértelmezései. A doktoriskolák II. nemzetközi konferenciája*. Budapest, 2008. augusztus 22–24. hrsg. I. Dobos, S. Bene, Budapest 2009. <http://mek.niif.hu/07600/07689/html/index.htm#2> und: „Önazonosság és idegenfelfogás a korai magyar történetírásban és ennek európai összefüggései,” [Identität und Fremdheitsvorstellungen in der früheren ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung und deren europäische Beziehungen] *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 113 (2009), 3–19; Vielen Dank für Stefan Rohdewald (Universität Passau) für die sprachliche Korrektur dieser Arbeit.

¹ A. Plassmann, *Origo Gentis*. Berlin 2006.

Bei den Ursprungsgeschichten ist es üblich, dass der Autor sein Volk von einer biblischen Person abstammen lässt.² Im Zusammenhang mit den Ungarn tauchen mehrere biblische Namen auf, von denen man ihre Vorfahren herleitete. Im 10. Jahrhundert gab es in Europa die Ansicht, dass die Ungarn die Söhne von Gog und Magog sind. Diese Meinung ist aus einem Brief bekannt, den ein Mönch aus einer dem hl. German geweihten Gemeinde dem Bischof von Verdun schrieb. Der Mönch widerlegt die Ansicht, nach der das Volk von Gog und Magog die Ungarn symbolisieren würde; seiner Meinung nach standen Gog und Magog für die Ketzer. Laut diesem Mönch konnte man bis jetzt über dieses Volk nichts hören, da es seinen Namen geändert hatte. Ihmzufolge haben die Ungarn (*Hungri*) wegen einer Hungersnot ihren Volksnamen bekommen.³

Eine andere biblische Abstammungstheorie wird mit dem Namen *Agareni* verbunden. Die Annalen von St. Gallen nennen die Ungarn bei diesem Namen. Die Bezeichnung verweist darauf, dass die Ungarn von Hagar, der Mutter Ismaels, abgeleitet wurden. Der Name *Agareni* war übrigens auch die Bezeichnung der Sarazenen in mittelalterlichen Quellen. In einer späteren Quelle ist von der jüdischen Abstammung der Ungarn die Rede. Ein Teil der Kabaren, die ein Hilfsvolk der Ungarn waren, hing der jüdischen Religion an. So konnte man in Westeuropa die Ungarn für Agarener und für Juden halten.⁴ Vielleicht steht der Name *Agarener* für die Ungarn, da die westeuropäischen Autoren einen solchen Namen gefunden haben, der mit dem Namen der Ungarn (*Ungri*) ähnlich klingt und aus der Bibel ableitbar ist.⁵

² Josephus Flavius lässt die Skythen von Magog abstammen, die Galater von Gomer. Hieronymus lässt die Spanier von Tubal abstammen. Bei Isidor von Sevilla stammen die Goten und die Skythen von Magog ab. Bei Fredegar stammen die Gallier von Jafet ab. A. Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel*. Stuttgart 1958, 388. 446–456, 459–461. Es gibt weitere Beispiele.

³ Eine neue Ausgabe des Briefes: A. Németh, „Dado verduni püspökhöz írt levél,” [Brief an Dado, Bischof v. Verdun] in *Források a korai magyar történelem ismeretéhez*, ed. A. Róna-Tas, Budapest 2001, 113–161. Nach Németh kennt man in Westeuropa den Brief in der Ausgabe von R. Huygens. (Un témoin de la crainte de l’an 1000: la lettre sur les Hongrois. *Latomus*, 15. 1956. 225–239.) Huygens datiert den Brief auf die Jahre um 960. Die ungarische Fachliteratur verwendet die Ausgabe von K. Heilig (Der Brief des Remigius von Auxerre um 900 über die Ungarn, *A gróf Klébelsberg Kunó Bécsi magyar Történetkutató Intézet Évkönyve* 3 (1933), 7–30.). Nach Heilig ist Dado der Adressat des Briefes. Németh kennt die beiden Ausgaben und hat weitere Manuskripte benutzt. Er vertritt die These, dass den Brief ein unbekannter Mönch geschrieben hat, der zur Gemeinde des hl. German gehörte. Er schrieb den Brief zwischen 917 und 932 an Dado, Bischof von Verdun.

⁴ P. Kulcsár, „A magyar ősmunda Anonymus elött,” [Die ungarische Ursage vor Anonymus] *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 91–92 (1987–1988), 523–545. „Herigeri et Anselmi gesta episcoporum Turgensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium,” ed. R. Koepke, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH) Scriptores* 7, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1846, 171–172.

⁵ Ekkehard erklärt die Gleichsetzung der Ungaren und der Agarenen für einen Irrtum. „Qui autem Ungros Agarenos putant, longa via errant.” Ekkehardi IV., *Casus S. Galli* cap.

Auch in den ungarischen Quellen ist es üblich geworden, das Volk von biblischen Personen abzuleiten. Die Urgesta (Urchronik), die am Anfang der ungarischen Chronistik steht, wurde nicht in unsere Zeit überliefert, deshalb kann man auf ihren Inhalt nur aus späteren Quellen schließen.⁶ So ist strittig, was in dieser Chronik über den Ursprung der Ungarn stand. Das Werk des anonymen Notars Bela III. (1172–1196) ist aber erhalten geblieben. Die Geschichtswissenschaft nennt diesen Autor Anonymus. Er verfasste sein Werk am Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts (gegen 1210) und lässt die Ungarn von Magog – dem Sohn des Jafet also – abstammen.⁷ Der Autor folgte mit der jafetischen Abstammungstheorie der europäischen Mode. Der Geschichtsschreiber von Ladislaus IV. (1272–1290), Simon von Kéza, schrieb sein Werk gegen 1282–1285. Auch er hält Jafet für den Ahnen der Ungarn, den Sohn von Jafet nennt er Thana, den Sohn von Thana ist bei ihm Menroth.⁸ Allerdings hat Jafet in der Bibel keinen Sohn namens Thana und keinen Enkel namens Menroth. Die Familie der „Chronik von Ofen“, die den Inhalt der Chronikkompilation aus der Epoche von Karl Anjou I. (1301/1309/13010–1342) überliefert hat, nennt Jafets Sohn Nemprot als Ahnen der Ungarn. Auch dies ist widersprüchlich, da Jafet keinen Sohn namens Nemprot hatte. Nimrod war aber der Name des Sohnes von Kus, der von Ham, dem verfluchten Sohn

9–10. Ed. Ildephonso Ab Arx, MGH Scriptorum 2. ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1829, 119.

⁶ Der Literaturhistoriker Ferenc Toldy (ursprünglich Schedel) meinte im 19. Jahrhundert, dass im 11. Jahrhundert eine erste Gesta in Ungarn zusammengestellt wurde. Es gab auch die Ansicht, dass es im 11. Jahrhundert in Ungarn keine Gesta gab. Die meisten Forscher sind aber gegenteiliger Meinung. Nach Sándor Domanovszky, János Horváth, Elemér Mályusz wurde sie unter König Andreas I. (1046–1060) zusammengestellt. György Györffy unterstützte 1948 diese These. (Gy. Györffy, *Kronikáink és a magyar őstörténet*. [Unsere Chroniken und die ungarische Urgeschichte] Budapest 1948.) Lajos J. Csóka OSB und József Gerics haben die Entstehung der Gesta in die 1060er Jahre, in die Zeit König Salomons, gelegt. Nach Raimund Friedrich Kaindl, László Geréb und Gyula Kristó könnte die Urchronik (Urgesta) unter König Koloman (1095–1116) entstanden sein. Györffy hat später seine frühere Ansicht geändert und meinte, dass die Gesta unter König Koloman verfasst worden sein könnte. Gy. Györffy, *Kronikáink és a magyar őstörténet. Régi kérdések, új válaszok*. [Unsere Chroniken und die ungarische Urgeschichte. Alte Fragen, neue Antworten] Budapest 1994. Kristó hält übrigens die Benennung Urchronik anstatt Urgesta für richtig. Siehe: Gy. Kristó, *A történeti irodalom Magyarországon a kezdetektől 1241-ig*. [Die Entfaltung der Historiografie in Ungarn von ihren Anfängen bis 1241] Budapest 1994; Gy. Kristó, *Magyar historiográfia I. Történetírás a középkori Magyarországon*. [Ungarische Historiografie I. Geschichtsschreibung in Ungarn im Mittelalter] Budapest 2002; Gy. Szabados, *A magyar történelem kezdetéről*. [Über die Anfänge der ungarischen Geschichte] Budapest 2006, 14–35. T. Szöcs, „A 14. századi krónikaszerkesztmény interpolációi és 11. századi okleveleink,” [Die Interpolationen der Chronikkompilation des 14. Jahrhunderts und unsere Urkunden des 11. Jahrhunderts] *Fons* 14:1 (2007), 59–95; N. Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der „nationes”*. *Nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter*. Köln–Weimar–Wien 1995.

⁷ Anonymi (P. Magistri) *Gesta Ungarorum*. 1. cap. ed. E. Jakubovich. Noten: D. Pais. *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum* (SRH). Bd. 1. hrsg. I. Szentpétery, Budapest 1937, 35.

⁸ *Simonis de Keza Gesa Ungarorum*. 4. cap. hrsg. S. Domanovszky, SRH 1: 143.

Noahs, abstammte. Die Chronikfamilie, die die Überlieferung aus der Epoche Ludwigs Anjou I. (1342–1382) erhalten hat und die „Familie der Bilderchronik“ genannt wird, lässt die Ungarn von Magog, dem Sohn Jafets, abstammen.⁹ Diese Überlieferung steht im Gegensatz zu einer anderen, nach der die Ungarn von dem verfluchten Sohn Ham abstammen würden. Daraus kann man auf den Inhalt der Urchronik schließen: Nach Elemér Mályusz ließ die Urchronik die Ungarn von Ham abstammen. In der Epoche König Matthias' (1458–1490) hat Johannes von Thurocz seine Chronik geschrieben (sie wurde 1488 in Brünn und Augsburg gedruckt.) Die Chronik des Johannes von Thurocz leitet die Ungarn von Hams Enkel Nimrod ab.¹⁰

Die erhaltene ungarische Chroniküberlieferung schreibt nicht, dass die Ungarn für das Volk von Gog und Magog stehen würden, die sich am Ende der Zeiten gegen Gott empören. Anonymus lässt aber Skythien neben dem Land des Gog und Magog liegen. In den ungarischen Ursprungsgeschichten wird damit die populäre jafetische Abstammungstheorie der europäischen Völker aufgegriffen. Daneben ist aber auch die Herleitung von dem verfluchten Sohn Ham bezeugt.

Ein anderer, besonders in Westeuropa verbreiteter Typ der Ursprungsgeschichten ist die Herleitung von Troja.¹¹ Isidor von Sevilla leitet das Volk der Galleci in Spanien von den Griechen des Teukros her, die am Trojanischen Krieg teilgenommen hatten.¹² Fredegar im 7. Jahrhundert und der Autor des *Liber Historiae Francorum* lassen die Franken von den Trojanern abstammen. Laut dem *Liber* zogen die Trojaner in die Gegend des Don, um dann durch den Sumpf des Asowschen Meeres nach Pannonien überzusetzen, wo sie die Stadt *Sicambria* (das spätere Ofen) gründeten. Von hier aus wanderten sie in Richtung ihrer heutigen westlichen Heimat.¹³ Dudo von St. Quentin, der Geschichtsschreiber der Normannen, leitet die Dänen von den Trojanern her. Ihre Heimat Dacia befindet sich bei ihm neben Skythien.¹⁴ Auch im fernen Norden wurde die Legende von Troja aufgegriffen. Im Prolog der Edda von Snorri steht, dass der berühmteste Hof in

⁹ Die Chronik von Johannes de Thurocz bestätigt, dass in der Zeit Karls und Ludwigs Anjou zwei Chronikkompilationen zusammengestellt wurden. Johannes de Thurocz, *Chronica Hungarorum*, Bd. I. hrsg. E. Galántai, I. Kristó, Budapest 1985. Beide sind im Original verloren. Sie sind aber in Kompilationen erhalten, die aus je fünf Codices bestehen. Die fünf Codices, die die Kompilation aus der Zeit Karls überliefern, nennt man die Familie der „Chronik von Ofen“.

¹⁰ Thuróczy erklärt auch die Herleitung von Jafets Sohn Magog und von Nimrod, dem Sohn von Kus (cap. 4.). Später berichtet er über Attila, dass sich dieser von Nimrod herleitete, und dass die Ungarn auch von Nimrod abstammten (cap. 6.) Die Abstammung von Álmos führt er über Nimrod und Ham bis Noah (cap. 28.).

¹¹ A. Eckhardt, *De Sicambria a Sans-Souci. Histories et légendes franco-hongroises*. Paris 1943, 11–51. S. Eckhardt, „Sicambria. Egy középkori monda életrajza,“ [Sicambria. Die Biographie einer mittelalterlichen Sage] *Minerva* 6 (1927), 157–201.

¹² Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, 452.

¹³ Ammianus Marcellinus: XV. 19. XXVIII. 5; Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, 151–153, 175–179.

¹⁴ Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, 248.

Tyrkland Troja war.¹⁵ In der ungarischen Chroniküberlieferung begegnen wir gleichfalls der Sage von Troja. Simon von Keza übernimmt die Ursprungsgeschichte der Venezianer in seine Chronik. Nach dieser Geschichte siedelten die Venezianer von Troja nach Aquileia über, von dort flohen sie vor den Hunnen in den Sumpf, und gründeten Venedig. Bei Simon von Kéza ist *Sicambria* die Stadt von Attila.¹⁶ Die ungarische Geschichtsschreibung benutzte die Trojasage aber nicht zur Herleitung der Ungarn. In der genannten Chronikkompiletion des 14. Jahrhunderts taucht aber die trojanische Herkunft der Franken auf. In der Bilderchronik stammen die Gallier von Gomer, dem Sohn des Jafet, ab. In Pannonien hätten sie eine Stadt namens *Sicambria* gegründet. Sie seien nicht auf Druck der Römer nach Westen gezogen, sondern aus Angst vor den östlichen Völkern. Sie würden – abgeleitet von ihrem Führer *Francio* – Franken genannt, und ihre Stadt nannten sie Paris. Mit der Benutzung der Trojasage kann der Verfasser die Verwandtschaft zwischen Ungarn und Franzosen betonen. Vielleicht wollte damit der Chronist in der Anjou-Epoche König Ludwig I. schmeicheln.¹⁷

Aus ungarischen Chroniken kennen wir das Bewusstsein der skythischen Herkunft gut. Nach Anonymus waren die Skythen mit den Ungarn gleichzusetzen. Als die Führer der Ungarn, Álmos und Árpád, vor einer Schlacht vor ihrem Heer eine Rede halten, nannten sie ihre Leute Skythen.¹⁸ Ein naheliegender Grund für den Vergleich der Ungarn mit den Skythen liegt in der ähnlichen Kampf- und Lebensweise. In der *Gesta* des Anonymus besiegen die Skythen Darius, Xerxes und sogar Alexander den Großen. Anonymus gibt damit den Ungarn siegreiche Ahnen. Das Bewusstsein der skythischen Herkunft taucht aber nicht nur in der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung auf, sondern in mehreren europäischen Geschichten. Der oben zitierte *Liber Historiae Francorum* und die Edda sehen die Trojaner auf einem Gebiet, das Skythien gleicht. Nach Jordanes wanderten die Goten aus Skandinavien (*Scandza*) nach Skythien. Tomyris, die Königin der Massageten, nennt er die Königin der Geten, die Geten setzt er aber mit den Goten gleich. Es gibt auch westeuropäische Autoren, die westeuropäische Völker von den Skythen herleiten. Beda Venerabilis lässt die Pikten aus Skythien abstammen.¹⁹ In der *Historia Brittonum*, dem Werk eines Verfassers des beginnenden 9. Jahrhunderts, ist von der skythischen Herkunft der Schotten und Iren die Rede. Der Autor hörte von den Schotten die folgende Ursprungsgeschichte: Ein Vornehmer aus Skythien musste aus seiner Heimat nach Ägypten fliehen. An

¹⁵ *Thw prose Edda by Snorri Sturluson*. tr. A. Gilchrist Brodeur. http://www.cybersamurai.net/Mythology/nordic_gods/LegendsSagas/Edda/ProseEdda/Prologue.htm (22. Mai, 2010. 15:32:27.)

¹⁶ Simonis de Keza. Cap. 15. 16. Kézai konnte aus einer venezianischen Chronik schöpfen. S. Eckhardt, „A Pannóniai hún történet keletkezése,” [Die Entstehung der pannonischen Hunnensage] *Századok* 62 (1928), 465–491, 605–632.

¹⁷ *Chronicon Hungarici Compositio Saeculi XIV*. cap. 3. SRH 1: 244–245. Eckhardt, *Sicambria*, 188.

¹⁸ Anonymus: Cap. 8. 39.

¹⁹ Beda Venerabilis, *Historiam ecclesiasticam gentis Anglorum*. (sic), I:1 <http://www.the-latinlibrary.com/bede/bede1.shtml>. Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, 61.

der Verfolgung der Juden nahm er nicht teil. Auch aus Ägypten musste er fliehen und zog mit seinen Leuten nach Spanien. Sein Volk ist sodann aus Spanien nach Irland, nach Dalriada, gewandert. Im Lebor Gabhala, einer irischen Heldensage, finden wir eine ähnliche Geschichte. Schotten und Skythen konnte man wegen der ähnlich klingenden Namen gleichsetzen.²⁰

In der ungarischen Überlieferung hat die Landnahme zwei Stufen: Pannonien erobern zuerst die Hunnen, dann die mit ihnen gleichgesetzten Ungarn. Eine ähnliche, sich in zwei Stufen abspielende Landnahme finden wir auch in der Ursprungsgeschichte der Normannen, die Dudo von St. Quentin geschrieben hat.²¹

Eine wiederkehrende Wendung der Ursprungsgeschichten ist die „Landnahme durch List“. Bekannt ist die Geschichte bei Justinus über die Gründung von Karthago: Die Flüchtlinge aus Tyros hätten in Afrika so viel Land gekauft, wie sie mit der Haut eines Ochsens bedecken konnten. Bei Widukind kauft ein Sachse Erde für Gold. In der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung können wir ähnliche Geschichten finden. Bei Anonymus sendet Fürst Árpád dem Fürsten Salan, dem Anführer der Bulgaren, zwölf weiße Pferde und andere Geschenke, und er bekommt von ihm Wasser und Gras. Später hätten die Ungarn das Land für ihr eigenes gehalten, da sie es gekauft hätten, und hätten Fürst Salan in einer Schlacht besiegt.²² In der Chronikkompilation aus dem 14. Jahrhundert sendet Árpád dem Fürst Swatopluk ein Pferd mit Sattel und Zaum, und bekommt von ihm Erde, Gras und Wasser. Später hätten sie das Land als ihr eigenes erklärt, da sie es gekauft hätten. Das so gekaufte Land hätten sie dann auch mit Waffengewalt erobert.²³

Die Abstammung der Herrscherfamilie von einem Tier ist auch erwähnenswert. In der Chronik des Fredegar zeugt Merovech ein Monster aus dem Meer. Bei Anonymus träumt die schwangere Emesu, die Frau von Ugek, dass sie von einem Vogel befruchtet worden wäre.²⁴ Ihr Sohn bekommt den Namen Álmos, was auf Ungarisch Traum bedeutet. In der Chronikkompilation aus dem 14. Jahrhundert erscheint ein Vogel der Frau von Ugek, als sie schwanger war.²⁵ Die Geschichte über die wundersame Abstammung konnte die Legitimität der Herrscherfamilie befestigen.²⁶

In Ursprungsgeschichten kommt es oft vor, dass der Autor ein Volk mit den Römern in Beziehung bringt. Entweder lässt er die Seinen von den Römern ab-

²⁰ Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, 94–95. Györy weiß auch, dass die *Historia Brittonum* eine skytische Abstammungsgeschichte enthält, aber er legt die Textgenese nicht ausführlicher dar.

²¹ Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, 248–255; P. Bauduin, „Autour d’une construction identitaire: la naissance d’une historiographie Normande a la charnière des Xe–XIe s.“ in *Des Normands aux Hongrois. Conquête, acculturation, identité: Les traces de la conquête*. dir. P. Nagy, Rouen 2000, 80–81.

²² Anonymus: Cap. 14, 16, 39 in SRH 1.

²³ *Chronica Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. Cap. 28. SRH 1: 287–290.

²⁴ Anonymus: Cap. 3. SRH 1: 38.

²⁵ *Chronica Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. Cap. 26. SRH 1: 284.

²⁶ I. P. Demény, „A fehér ló mondája,“ [Die Sage des weißen Rosses] in ders. *Hősi epika*, K. Gazda, Budapest 2002, 74–75.

stammen, oder er lässt sein Volk mit Römern erfolg- oder verlustreiche Kämpfe führen. In der ungarischen Überlieferung tauchen die Römer auch auf. Bei Simon von Kéza kämpfen die mit den Ungarn gleichgesetzten Hunnen gegen die Römer. Die Quellen nennen Ungarn mehrmals die Weide der Römer (*pascua Romanorum*). In Ungarn lebte also auch im 13. Jahrhundert das Bewusstsein, dass ein Teil des Landes einmal zum Römischen Reich gehört hatte.²⁷ Bei Anonymus kämpfen die Ungarn während der Landnahme mit den Römern. Sie besiegen sie bei Veszprém, und die Römer fliehen nach Deutschland.²⁸ Nach Gyula Kristó bedeuten hier die Römer diejenige Deutschen, die in Ungarn das Geleit der Königin Gertrud – der Frau des Königs Andreas II. (1205–1235) – gebildet hatten. Darauf kann jene Äußerung des Anonymus hinweisen, in der er schreibt, die Ungarn hätten die Römer bei Veszprém besiegt: Veszprém war die Stadt der Königin.²⁹

Eine interessante Frage der Fremdheitsvorstellung ist, wie sich die christlichen Autoren zu der heidnischen Vergangenheit ihres Volkes verhalten haben. Nehmen sie sich ihrer an, oder verschweigen sie sie, bekennen sie sich zu ihr oder wollen sie sie verschönern? Widukind erwähnt die Irminsul, die die Sachsen „gemäß der Irrlehre unser Väter“ verehrt hatten. Er verleugnet die Ahnen nicht, aber mit ihrem Glauben identifiziert er sich auch nicht. Karl der Große hat nach Widukind die Sachsen teils mit Überredung, teils mit Zwang bekehrt. Franken und Sachsen, die einst Bundesgenossen waren, wurden gleichsam zu einem Volk im christlichen Glauben. Widukind betrachtet also Karl als Bekehrer, nicht als Unterwerfer.³⁰ Thietmar von Merseburg berichtet auch über die Irminsul, aber er betrachtet die Verehrer der Irminsul nicht als Ahnen, nur als die Alten (*antiques*). An einer anderen Stelle der Chronik erzählt er einen sächsischen Sieg über Karl den Großen. In dieser Geschichte identifiziert sich Thietmar mit den Sachsen (*nostris*), aber er schreibt nicht über sie, dass sie Heiden wären. Der Merseburger Bischof identifiziert sich mit der Tapferkeit der Ahnen, aber nicht mit ihrem Heidentum. An Karl den Großen erinnert er sich ehrfürchtig, und er erwähnt die Bistümer, die Karl gegründet hat.³¹

In dem bereits genannten Werk Dudos von St. Quentin spielt sich die Landnahme der Dänen in zwei Stufen ab. Diese Wendung gibt ihm die Möglichkeit, den Gegensatz zwischen Heidentum und Christentum hervorzuheben. Hasting, der Führer der Dänen, sei aus der östlichen Urheimat in der Nachbarschaft von Skythien in die spätere Heimat der Normannen gezogen. Der Autor stellt ihn als

²⁷ Gy. Kristó, „Rómaiak és vlachok Nyestornál és Anonymusnál,” [Römer und Wlachen bei Nestor und bei Anonymus] *Századok* 112 (1978), 652–656.

²⁸ Anonymus: Cap. 48. SRH 1: 97–98.

²⁹ Kristó, „Rómaiak és vlachok,” 624–632. Ungarische Edelleute töteten Königin Gertrud 1213. Nach Győry geht es hier um die Steuer, die für den Papst entrichtet werden musste. J. Győry, *Gesta regum, gesta nobilium: Tanulmány Anonymus krónikájáról*. Budapest 1948, 35.

³⁰ Widukind I. 12. 15. in *Quellensammlung zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte*. Fortsetzung, CD-ROM Berlin 1999.

³¹ *Thietmari merseburgensis episcopi: Chronicon*. Thietmar von Merseburg: Chronik. Neu übertragen und erläutert von W. Trillmich, Darmstadt 1974, II: 2, VII: 75.

barbarischen, heidnischen Führer dar, um die Würde Rollos, des nachfolgenden Fürsten, hervorzuheben. Rollo kommt bei Dudo auch aus der östlichen Urheimat, aber er ist danach zum christlichen Glaube übergetreten.³²

Eine wirkungsvolle Gegenüberstellung der heidnischen und christlichen Vergangenheit finden wir auch bei dem Geschichtsschreiber der Polen im 12. Jahrhundert, bei Gallus Anonymus. Nach seiner Erzählung gibt der Fürst Popiel den Wanderern keine Unterkunft, worauf er von den Mäusen gefressen wird. Der Bauer Piast, so Gallus, bewirtet die Wanderer, und nach Popiels Tod wird sein Nachkomme zum Fürsten gewählt. Mieszko, der Nachkomme von Piast, bekehrte die Polen zum christlichen Glauben. Das Schicksal von Popiel und Piast kann man als Gegenüberstellung von Heidentum und Christentum deuten. Piast ist würdig, Vorfahre christlicher Könige zu werden, Popiel aber wird von Mäusen verzehrt.³³ Die Abgrenzung von der heidnischen Vergangenheit ist allerdings nicht so scharf, da sich unter den Heiden auch der brave Piast befindet. Über Popiels Fürstentum berichtet Gallus sogar, dass die Fürsten damals nicht so hochmütig gewesen seien.

Cosmas von Prag, der Verfasser der tschechischen Urgeschichte im 12. Jahrhundert, stellt die heidnische Vergangenheit nicht dem Christentum gegenüber. Er betrachtet sogar die christliche Geschichte als Fortsetzung der heidnischen Epoche und er lobt Přemysl, den Gründer der Dynastie.³⁴

Die ungarische Urchronik ist, wie bereits erwähnt, nicht erhalten geblieben. Die Meinungen sind daher unterschiedlich, was in diesem Werk über die Ahnen der Ungarn gestanden haben könnte. Nach Bálint Hóman und Sánor Eckhardt soll die Urchronik die Ungarn von Magog abstammen haben lassen.³⁵ Mályusz glaubt aufgrund des vierten Kapitels der Chronikkompilation des 14. Jahrhunderts bestätigen zu können, dass die Urchronik die Ungarn von dem verfluchten Sohn Ham abgeleitet hat. Die Chronikkompilation aus dem 14. Jahrhundert stellt die Einwohner Skythiens zuerst als dunkelfarbige, faule Leute dar, anschließend werden sie als tapferes Volk charakterisiert, das nicht einmal von den Makedonen besiegt werden konnte. Nach Mályusz stand in der Urchronik diese wenig schmeichelhafte Herleitung, und der Chronist der Urchronik sei mit den vorchristlichen Ungarn nicht solidarisch.³⁶ Die „Gesta der christlichen Ungarn“, die

³² Plassmann, *Origo gentis*, 248–255. Bauduin, „Autour d’une construction identitaire,” 80–81.

³³ D. Bagi, *Gallus Anonymus és Magyarország*. [Gallus Anonymus und Ungarn] Budapest 2005, 75–83; auch: „Heidentum und Christentum in der Urgeschichtsdarstellungen der ersten Historischen Synthesen Ostmitteleuropas im Mittelalter – Eine historische Region und zwei Modelle,” *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 54:2 (2005), 159–173.

³⁴ Bagi, *Gallus Anonymus*, 86.

³⁵ B. Hóman, *A Szent László-kori Gesta Ungarorum és a XII–XIII. századi leszármazói*. [Die Gesta aus der Epoche des Heiligen Ladislaus und ihre Nachkommen aus dem XII.–XIII. Jahrhundert] Budapest 1925, S. 96–97. Echhardt, „Attila a mondában,” [Attila in der Sage] in *Attila és hunjai*, ed. Gy. Németh, Budapest 1940, 185.

³⁶ *Chronica Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV* Cap. 3–5, SRH 1: 243–255. E. Mályusz, „Krónika-problémák,” *Századok* 100 (1966), 720.

zwischen 1192 und 1237 entstanden sein mag, schreibt nichts Negatives über die Ahnen der Ungarn. Eine Gruppe um den Dominikanerbruder Julian brach aufgrund dieser Gesta auf, um die östliche Urheimat der Ungarn zu finden (1235).³⁷ Anonymus schildert am Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts die landnehmenden Ungarn, und die Zeiten vor der Bekehrung der Ungarn bzw. König Stephans des Heiligen ruhmvoll. Den Namen des Führers Álmos erklärt er aus dem Lateinischen *almus* als *heilig*. Álmos wird vom Heiligen Geist geholfen, und sein Sohn Árpád betet zu Gott vor der Schlacht.³⁸ Das Volk von Skythien stellt Anonymus zuerst idealisiert dar, bis das sympathische Bild plötzlich widerwärtig wird: die Skythen werden zu einem Volk von Menschenfressern. Anonymus benutzte als Quelle die am Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts verfasste Chronik von Regino, und auch Reginos Quelle, die im 6./7. Jahrhundert verfasste *Exordia Scythica*.³⁹ Bei den sich selbst als zivilisiert verstehenden Autoren war es seit langem Brauch, die weit entfernten Völker idealistisch zu charakterisieren. Es ist auch nicht das erste Mal, dass dasselbe Volk zuerst sympathisch, dann widerwärtig dargestellt wurde. Als Ambrosiaster die Auslegung des Briefes des hl. Paulus schrieb, stellte er die Skythen zuerst sympathisch dar, dann aber als Menschenfresser.⁴⁰ Ein solches zweiseitiges, sich von gut zu schlecht wendendes Bild begegnet uns auch bei Anonymus. Die Erinnerung des heidnischen Glaubens blitzt bei ihm in jener Szene auf, in der Álmos und seine Leute den „unsterblichen Göttern“ Opfer bringen, und als Ond, Ketel und Tarcál ein weißes Pferd opfern und *aldamas* halten.⁴¹ Die Ereignisse der Landnahme sind bei ihm nicht als Gegensatz von Heiden und Christen dargestellt. Bei der Darstellung der Streifzüge erwähnt er zwar, dass die Ungarn einen Bischof töteten, und die Kirchen Gottes plünderten.⁴² Im Allgemeinen betont er aber eher die Tapferkeit der Ahnen als ihr Heidentum.

³⁷ Kristó, *Magyar historiográfia*, 44–46.

³⁸ Anonymus: Cap. 3, 8, 39. SRH 1: 38, 44, 81.

³⁹ Győr 1948; Gy. Kristó, „Az *Exordia Scythica*, Regino és a magyar krónikák,” [Exordia Scythica, Regino und die ungarische Chroniken] *Filológiai Közlemények* 16 (1970), 106–115.

⁴⁰ Ambrosius, „*Commentarium in Epistolam B. Pauli ad Colossenses*,” in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 17, 460–461. http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/02m/0339-0397,_Ambrosius,_In_Epistolam_Beati_Pauli_Ad_Colossenses,_MLT.pdf (25. Oktober 2010, 11:20) Fraesdorff, *Der Barbarische Norden*. Berlin 2005, 292. (Die Kommentare der 13 Paulusbriefe stammen nicht vom heiligen Ambrosius, sondern von einem unbekannten Autoren, den die Forschung *Ambrosiaster* nennt, der in der Zeit des Papstes Damasus I. (366–384) lebte. F.-R. Erkens, *Herrschersakralität im Mittelalter*. Stuttgart 2006, 77.) Als Quelle der *Exordia* betrachtet man üblicherweise das Werk von Justin aus dem 3. Jahrhundert, der aus dem bis heute verloren gegangenen Werk von Pompeius Trogus einen Auszug übermittelt. Bei Justin gibt es aber kein ambivalentes Skythenbild.

⁴¹ „... *more paganism occiso equo pinguissimo magnum aldamas fecerunt*.“ Anonymus: Cap. 16. *Áldomás* bedeutet in der heutigen ungarischen Sprache Toast, Gelage. Das Verb *áld* bedeutet aber segnen.

⁴² Anonymus: Cap. 53. SRH 1: 106–108; Cap. 56, SRH 1: 111–113.

Die *Gesta* von Kézai nimmt Attila und die Hunnen als Vorgänger an. Es bleibt nicht ohne Erwähnung, dass die Hunnen die hl. Ursula töteten.⁴³ Dort gibt Attila aber an einer anderen Stelle der Bitte des Papstes nach, und verschont Rom – stattdessen rottet er die Arianer Ravennas aus.⁴⁴

Die Chronikkompilation aus dem 14. Jahrhundert erklärt den Kampf der Ungarn gegen die Christen auf interessante Weise. Als die Führer der Ungarn Lehel und Bulcsu in Gefangenschaft geraten seien, seien sie vom Kaiser gefragt worden, warum sie mit den Christen so grausam seien. Die gefangenen Führer hätten geantwortet, sie seien die Geißeln Gottes, „... und ihr nehmt uns gefangen, und könnt uns töten, wenn wir aufhören, euch zu verfolgen.“⁴⁵ Die westlichen Autoren haben heidnische Angriffe, so auch die ungarischen Streifzüge, als Strafe Gottes aufgefasst. Der Autor legt diese Gedanken in den Mund der gefangenen Ungarnführer, so dass die Ungarn dem Willen Gottes gefolgt zu sein scheinen. Der Autor entschuldigt damit die Tatsache, dass die Ungarn gegen Christen gekämpft haben.

In den 1280er Jahren wurde gegen die Ansicht der Chronik des Simon von Kéza ein Gedicht (ein Offizium) über König Stephan den Heiligen, den ersten christlichen König der Ungarn verfasst. Das Gedicht stellt Heidentum und Christentum einander gegenüber. Attila erscheint in diesem Gedicht als ungarischer König. Der Dichter führt ihn als heidnischen, grausamen Herrscher ein. Ihm gegenüber ist Stephan der heilige König, der das Heidentum besiegt. Der Dichter kontrastiert die beiden Herrscher mit einer erfinderischen Sprachwendung – *crudelitas, credulitas*: „*Vertitur crudelitas / Quo figuras transmutante / Formatur credulitas*.“ Das Gedicht nennt den Fürsten Géza, den Vater von König Stephan, heilig.⁴⁶ Die Entgegenstellung des heidnischen und des heiligen Königs erinnert an

⁴³ Simonis de Keza: Cap. 13. SRH 1: 155–156.

⁴⁴ Simonis de Keza: Cap. 17. SRH 1: 159–160.

⁴⁵ *Chronica Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV.* Cap. 60.

⁴⁶ L. Mezey, „Szent István XIII. századi verses históriája,“ [St. Stephans Vershistorie aus dem 13. Jahrhundert] in *Magyar századok. Irodalmi műveltségünk történetéhez*, Budapest 1948, 41–51. (Resümee auf Deutsch v. J. Eckmann, „Ungarische Jahrhunderte. Zur Geschichte der ungarischen literarischen Bildung,“ *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 24:3–4 (1952); T. Dér, *Szent István és Szent László alakja magyarországi latin nyelvű liturgikus énekekben*. Szeged 2004. (PhD Dissertation, Manuskript). D. Terézia, „Die Gestalt des heiligen Stephan und des heiligen Ladislaus in den in Ungarn entstandenen, mittelalterlichen, lateinischen, liturgischen Gesängen,“ *Chronica* 5 (2005), 137–141. Nach Mezey hebt Kézai die Bedeutung von Attila hervor, und stuft die Bedeutung des heiligen Stephan herab. Nach Dér wollte Kézai die Bedeutung des heiligen Stephan nicht schmälern. Attila ist bei Kézai nicht wegen seines Heidentums ein Vorbild, sondern er sollte in Kézais Werk als Beispiel für einen unbesiegbaren, mit seinem eigenen Volk strengen Herrscher vor der Herrschaft von Ladislaus IV. stehen. Nach Dér ist dieses Offizium eine Antwort auf die Lockerung im Glauben, die sich am Hof Ladislaus' IV. vollzog, und kontrastiert damit die Auffassung der Kézai-Gesta, die die vorchristliche Epoche der Ungarn hervorhebt. Dér, *Szent István és Szent László*, 79–80, 93–95, 197. Fürst Géza hat begonnen, seine Untertanen zum Christentum zu bekehren, aber laut dem zeitgenössischen Chronisten Thietmar von Merseburg hat er auch heidnische Götter verehrt. Thietmar

das Werk Dudos von St. Quentin, in dem der heidnische Hasting als Gegenpart des christlichen Rollo positioniert ist.⁴⁷

Dániel Bagi vergleicht das Verhältnis der ungarischen Urgesta, des Gallus und des Cosmas zum Heidentum und Christentum. In allen drei Ländern begleitete eine Krisenperiode den Übertritt zum Christentum. Bei den Tschechen äußerte sich diese aber in der Fehde unter zwei Sippen, den Přemysliden und den Slavnikiden, und spielte sich schon am Ende des 10. Jahrhunderts ab. Dies war schon zu lange her, um Cosmas zu beeinflussen. Die Heidenaufstände in Polen um 1030 und in Ungarn 1046 und 1061 hingegen konnten auf die Autoren der polnischen und ungarischen Geschichte einen tieferen Eindruck machen.⁴⁸

Die mittelalterlichen Geschichtswerke stammten aus der Feder christlicher Autoren. In ihnen spiegelt sich die christliche Anschauung wider. Wenn die ungarische Urchronik eine hamitische Ursprungsgeschichte entfaltet, dann grenzt sie sich im Vergleich mit den oben erwähnten Werken sehr scharf von der heidnischen Vergangenheit ab, da sie nicht nur die heidnische Religion und den heidnischen Herrscher verurteilt, sondern das ganze Volk. Eine solche scharfe Abgrenzung kann man vielleicht bei Dudo von St. Quentin finden. Die scharfe Distanzierung könnte man damit erklären, dass unter den geprüften Werken die ungarische Gesta der heidnischen Vergangenheit am nächsten steht. Jene Werke, die mit größerem Abstand zur heidnischen Epoche entstanden sind, wagen eher aufleben zu lassen, was in der Vergangenheit ruhmvoll gewesen sein soll.

Wenn wir die Ursprungsgeschichten miteinander vergleichen, können wir bestätigen, dass solche Sagen, die in den europäischen Gesten modisch gewesen waren, auch in der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung vorkommen. In manchen Fällen (biblische, skythische, trojanische Abstammung, Beziehungen zu den Römern) ist dies auf die gemeinsame Lektüre der Autoren zurückführen, aber manche Ursprungsgeschichten (z. B. die Abstammung von einem Tier) konnten sich auch unabhängig voneinander entwickeln. In den ungarischen Geschichten fin-

nennt den Fürsten *Deuvix*, (VIII. 4.). Diesen setzt man mit *Geycha*, *Geysa* gleich, der in den ungarischen Quellen vorkommt.

⁴⁷ In der so genannten Ungarisch-polnischen Chronik ist ein ähnlicher Aufbau anzutreffen. Das Werk will die Bekehrung der Ungarn darstellen. Am Anfang ist Aquila (Attila) ungarischer König die Hauptfigur, dann Jesse (Géza) und Stephan der Heilige. Die Chronik wurde Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts in Krakau, in der Zeit Bolesławs V. (des Schamhaften, 1234–1279) geschrieben. Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa*, 655; Hóman, *A Szent László-kori Gesta Ungarorum*, 37–41; B. Karácsonyi, „Tanulmányok a magyar-lengyel krónikáról,“ [Aufsätze über die Ungarisch-polnische Chronik] *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica* 16 (1964), 1–63; *Chronicon Ungarico-Polonorum*. Pflöge: J. Deér in SRH 2: 289–320; Thomas von Split schildert die vorchristliche Vergangenheit der Ungarn auch in dunklen Tönen. Nach ihm war Attila, der Führer der Ungarn ein erbarmungsloser Verfolger der Christen (*ferocissimus persecutor christianorum*). Er erwähnt, dass Géza das Christentum unter den Ungarn verbreitet (Cap. 14, S. 43.) und dass Stephan eine Krone bekommen habe, und berichtet über die Bemühungen des Königs, die Kirchenorganisation voranzutreiben (Cap. 15, S. 46).

⁴⁸ Bagi, *Gallus Anonymus*, 86–87.

den wir unter den biblischen Ursprungsgeschichten neben der verbreiteten jafetischen Ableitung auch das hamitische Ursprungskonzept. Die trojanische und skythische Ursprungstheorie, die Landnahme in zwei Stufen, das Verhältnis zu den Römern sind alle Wendungen, die sowohl in der westeuropäischen als auch in der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung gebräuchlich waren. Die mittelalterlichen Autoren haben diese beliebten Wendungen zusammen mit ihrer eigenen Überlieferung eingesetzt, um für ihr Volk eine Ursprungsgeschichte zu schreiben.

Les aspects des activités des légats pontificaux en Hongrie aux XI^e–XIII^e siècles*

GERGELY KISS



Les activités des représentants pontificaux en Hongrie aux XI^e–XIII^e siècles étaient très complexes. Une telle proposition semble être banale ; pourtant, celui, ou celle qui entreprend de résumer brièvement les activités des « légats » pontificaux dans le créneau ainsi décrit tombe aussitôt dans un piège tendu. Pourquoi ? La réponse consiste en deux éléments, qui sont le défaut d'une part des études systématiques portant sur les représentants eux-mêmes pour en constituer des bases de données prosopographiques, d'autre part celui de la distinction rigoureuse des formes de représentations. Malgré quelques tentatives, par exemple le manuel de Vilmos Fraknói prenant en considération les relations du Saint-Siège avec la Hongrie¹ ou son étude de cas sur Juan de Carvajal,² ainsi que celle de Tibor Almási sur Jacques de Pecorari³ ou encore de József Gerics, Erzsébet Ladányi,⁴

* This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (BO/00530/08/2). Le texte est la version notée de la présentation scientifique de mon habilitation.

¹ V. Fraknói, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római Szent-székkal* [Les relations ecclésiastiques et politiques de la Hongrie et du Saint Siège de Rome], t. I. (1000–1417) Budapest 1901. (dans ce qui suit : Fraknói 1901)

² W. Fraknói, « Cardinal Johannes Carvajal's Legationen in Ungarn, 1448–1461 » *Ungarische Revue* 10 (1890), 1–18, 124–143, 399–425.

³ T. Almási, « Pecorari Jakab diplomáciai pályája, » [Carrière diplomatique de Jacques de Pecoraria], dans *Tanulmányok Karácsonyi Béla hetvenedik születésnapjára*, Szeged 1989, 59–69. (dans ce qui suit : Almási 1989); *idem*, « Egy ciszterci bíboros a pápai világhatalom szolgálatában. Pecorari Jakab bíboros magyarországi legációja, » [Un cardinal cistercien au service du pouvoir mondial des papes. La légation de Jacques de Pecoraria en Hongrie], dans : *Magyar Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok* 5 : 1–2 (1993), 129–141.

⁴ J. Gerics, « Politikai gondolkodás Magyarországon VII. Gergely korában » [Idéologie politique en Hongrie au temps de Grégoire VII], dans : *Idem* : *Egyház, állam és gondolkodás Magyarországon a középkorban*, [Église, état et idéologie politique en Hongrie au Moyen Âge] Budapest 1995, 144–164. (dans ce qui suit : Gerics 1995); J. Gerics–E. Ladányi, « A Szent-szék és a magyar állam a 11. században » [Le Saint Siège et la Hongrie

Kornél Szovák⁵ et László Solymosi⁶ sur les relations hungaro-pontificales aux XI^e-XIII^e siècles, il reste beaucoup à faire.

Il est nécessaire, avant tout, de définir la notion de légat - terme généralisé pour décrire le représentant des papes. Dans cette perspective, je passe brièvement en revue les formes de représentations des premiers siècles jusqu'à la fin de l'époque indiquée dans le titre.

Il existait - en deux mots - une large variété de représentants de l'évêque de Rome dès les premiers siècles. A côté des envoyés occasionnels (*ad hoc*), qui pouvaient être de simples messagers (*missi, oratores*) ou des représentants autorisés à exercer une juridiction plus ou moins limitée (les légats), il existait aussi des représentants permanents sur certains territoires (le Patrimoine de saint Pierre, par exemple). Ces derniers se désignaient par différents noms : *apocrisiarius, rector, defensor, vicarius*. Ce régime changea radicalement dans la deuxième partie du XI^e siècle. La réforme de l'Église a redéfini l'institution de la représentation pontificale, ce qui aboutit à l'imposition des légats. Terme quasi « universel », il fut employé presque exclusivement désormais pour désigner les représentants des papes, qu'il s'agisse de simples messagers ou d'un représentant habilité à exercer les pleins pouvoirs. C'est ici que l'on touche le fond du problème : le plein pouvoir (*plenitudo potestatis*). Il faut attendre la réponse des canonistes du XIII^e siècle pour avoir une distinction correcte des différentes formes de représentations. Trois types se sont dessinés : 1) *legatus missus* (« messenger », recruté dans les niveaux inférieurs de la hiérarchie, sans avoir une autorisation de juridiction) ; 2) *legatus a latere* (« légat envoyé du côté du pape », autorisé avec plein pouvoir, recruté parmi les cardinaux) ; 3) *legatus natus* (légat-né, représentant permanent, plus ou moins représentatif, recruté surtout parmi les archevêques des provinces ecclésiastiques).⁷

au XI^e siècle], dans I. Zombori, éd., *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*, [Millénaire des relations du Siège Apostolique et la Hongrie] Budapest 1996, (dans ce qui suit : Zombori 1996) 9-20. (dans ce qui suit : Gerics-Ladányi 1996).

⁵ K. Szovák, « Pápai-magyar kapcsolatok a 12. században » [Relations de Rome et de la Hongrie au XII^e siècle], dans Zombori 1996, 21-46. (dans ce qui suit : Szovák 1996).

⁶ L. Solymosi, « Egyházi-politikai viszonyok a pápai hegemonia idején » [Relations ecclésiastiques et politiques à l'époque de l'hégémonie de la Papauté], dans Zombori 1996, 47-56. (dans ce qui suit : Solymosi 1996).

⁷ Cf. P. Blet, *Histoire de la Représentation Diplomatique du Saint Siège des origines à l'aube du XIX^e siècle*, Città del Vaticano 1982 ; R. C. Figueira, « The Classification of medieval papal legates in the Liber Extra », *Archivum historiae pontificae* 21 (1983), pp. 211-228. ; Idem, « *Legatus apostolicae sedis*. The pope's alter ego according to thirteenth century canon law », *Studi medievali* III:27, (1986), pp. 527-574. ; Idem, « Decretalists, medieval papal legation and the Roman law of offices and jurisdiction », *Res publica litterarum. Studies in the classical tradition* 9 (1986), 119-135 ; Idem, « The medieval papal legate and his province. Geographical limitations of jurisdiction », *Apollinaris* 61 (1988), 817-860 ; Idem, « Papal Reserved Powers and the Limitations of Legatine Authority », dans J. R. Sweeney-S. Chodorow, eds., *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca 1989, 191-211 ; Idem, « Subdelegation by Papal Legates in Thirteenth-Century Canon

En traitant les « légations » des XI^e-XIII^e siècles en Hongrie, l'on se heurte immédiatement à de divers obstacles. D'une part le manque de sources (chartes, sources narratives) rend difficile l'identification des personnes, d'autre part la définition de la matière des légations pose aussi bien des problèmes. Malgré ces problèmes je tente ici d'aborder le sujet, dans ce qui suit, d'une manière thématique, même si les différents types des légations s'entremêlaient régulièrement.

Diplomatie : querelles d'investitures – soutien des papes réformateurs

Les relations de la papauté et de la Hongrie au cours des deux premiers siècles avaient un caractère à la fois juridique et diplomatique. Le premier est issu des querelles d'investiture éclatées à partir du dernier tiers du XI^e siècle. Le couronnement d'Étienne I^{er} (1000-1038) fut le résultat d'un compromis du pape Sylvestre II et de l'empereur Otton III permettant le jeune roi d'exercer une autorité assez large sur les affaires séculières et ecclésiastiques. En revanche, à partir des années 1070 – suivant la redéfinition du pouvoir pontifical (*Libertas Ecclesiae, divina potestas, plenitudo potestatis*) – elle fut largement limitée qui aboutit à un contre-coup idéologique, notamment à la formulation de la conception des « droits apostoliques » et de l'exercice d'une autorité *utroque iure* du roi Étienne I^{er}.⁸ Le débat surgi autour des droits d'investiture – et, en générale, portant sur l'exercice du pouvoir par le roi dans les affaires ecclésiastiques – thématisaient surtout les relations du Siège Apostolique et la Hongrie.

En 1091, juste après la campagne militaire du roi Ladislas I^{er} (1077-1095), un légat arriva à la fondation de l'abbaye bénédictine de Somogyvár (subordonnée à Saint-Gilles du Gard)⁹ pour persuader le roi à se ranger auprès du pape Urbain II contre l'empereur Henri IV, ainsi que pour arranger le statut juridique de la Croatie, envisagée comme *patrimonium Petri* depuis le règne de Grégoire VII. Les

Law. Powers and Limitations », dans S. B. Bowman, and B. E. Cody, eds., *In Iure Veritas. Studies in Canon Law in Memory of Schafer Williams*. Cincinnati 1991, 36-79.

⁸ *Legenda S. Stephani regis ab Hartvico episcopo conscripta*, cap. 9-10. : « Quibus auditis valde gavisus Romanus pontifex, cuncta, prout fuerant postulata, benigne concessit. Crucem insuper ferendam regi, velut in signum apostolatus misit, « ego » iniquiens « sum apostolicus, ille vero merito Christi apostolus, per quem tantum sibi populum Christus convertit. Quapropter dispositioni eiusdem, prout divina ipsum gratia instruit, ecclesias simul cum populis utroque iure ordinandas reliquimus. » Inpetratis ergo omnibus, prout petiit, presul Ascribus letus ad propria remeavit, secum ferens, propter que inceptum iter peregerat. Benedictionis ergo apostolice litteris cum corona et cruce simul allatis presulibus cum clero, comitibus cum populo laudes congruas adclamantibus, dilectus deo Stephanus rex unctione crismali perunctus, diademate regalis dignitatis feliciter coronatur. Scriptores rerum hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum edendo operi Emericus Szentpéteri, I-II, Budapestini, 1937-1938, t. II. 412-414. Cf. Gerics 1995, Gerics-Ladányi 1996.

⁹ « Teuzo sancte Romane Ecclesie legatus », « Teuzo cardinalis » *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima*, edendo operi Georgius Györffy, Budapestini 1992, Vol. 1, 1000-1131. (dans ce qui suit : DHA) nr. 88, 89.

négociations du légat Teuzo restèrent infructueuses, en 1092 le roi Ladislas s'attacha à l'empereur.¹⁰

Quatre ans plus tard, le pape Urbain II essaya de « regagner » le roi Coloman, en lui adressant une lourde admonestation qui reflétait la politique de son prédécesseur, Ladislas. Le pape fit savoir à Coloman l'envoi d'un *apocrisarius*, Odilon, abbé de Saint-Gilles du Gard.¹¹ Bien que la crédibilité du renoncement au droits d'investiture par le roi Coloman (1095–1116) – lors du synode de Guastalla en 1106 – soit fort contestée,¹² la deuxième moitié du XII^e siècle porta des succès au Saint Siège : les rois Géza II et Étienne III se montrèrent favorables à renoncer au droit d'investiture (nomination et translation des prélats, gestion des biens ecclésiastiques, en 1159 (?), 1161 et 1169).

Les légats des années 1110 et surtout ceux du pape Alexandre III s'inscrivent dans le même contexte. Cunon, cardinal-évêque de Praeneste (1107[?]-1122), un des plus actifs diplomate-légats des papes Pascal II et Callixte II avait la tâche de

¹⁰ La qualité du légat Teuzo est bien contestée – qu'il s'agisse de celui d'Urbain II ou bien de l'antipape Clément III. Cf. G. Kiss, « 'Teuzo sancte Romane Ecclesie legatus ... Teuzo cardinalis' Adalékok az I. László-kori pápai-magyar kapcsolatok történetéhez » [„Teuzo sancte Romane Ecclesie legatus ... Teuzo cardinalis”. Contribution à l'histoire de relations diplomatiques de la papauté et de la Hongrie aux temps de Ladislas I^{er}] dans F. Piti, éd., „Magyaroknak eleiről” Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendő Makk Ferenc tiszteletére, Szeged 2000, 265–276 ; « 'Teuzo sancte Romane Ecclesie legatus ... Teuzo cardinalis' Contribution aux relations de la Papauté et du roi hongrois Ladislas I^{er} à la fin du XI^e siècle », dans *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis V*. Redigunt M. Font, G. Kiss, Pécs 2009, 29–39 ; F. Makk, *Magyar külpolitika 896–1196*. [Relations diplomatiques de la Hongrie 896–1196] Thèse de doctorat de l'Académie, dact. 2 vols., Szeged 1990. I, 207, II, 94. note 137 ; P. Kehr, *Zur Geschichte Wiberts von Ravenna (Clemens III.)*, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie des Wissenschaften Sitzung der philosophisch-historischen Klasse vom 7. April, 2 Bde*. Berlin 1921–1922. surtout I, 361. et note 2. ; H.-W. Klewitz, « Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums », *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 25 (1936), 167–168, 172 ; K. Jordan, « Die Stellung Wiberts von Ravenna in der Publizistik des Investiturstreits », *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 62 (1954), 156 ; A. Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–1099). I. Herkunft und kirchliche Laufbahn. Der Papst und die lateinische Christenheit*, Stuttgart 1964, 167 ; G. Kiss, « La fondation d'une abbaye bénédictine de Somogyvár », dans S. Csernus, K. Korompay, éd. *Les Hongrois et l'Europe: conquête et intégration*, Paris–Szeged 1997 [1999], 327–341 ; G. Kiss, « A somogyvári apátság alapítása és francia kapcsolatai » [La fondation de l'abbaye de Somogyvár et ses relations avec la France], *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 2 : 1 (2000), 43–61 ; E. Magnani, « Réseaux monastiques et réseaux de pouvoir. Saint-Gilles du Gard : du Languedoc à la Hongrie (IX^e–début XIII^e siècle), » *Provence Historique* 54 : 215 (2004), 3–26.

¹¹ Le pape résuma la politique de Ladislas I^{er} à un ton très négatif : « *Iam diu enim Ungarorum populi errorum devia secuti sunt, et derelectis sue salutis pastoribus alienorum gregum vestigis adheserunt [...] utrum ad salutem regni tui et ad populi tui eruditionem Apostolicæ Sedis apocrisarios destinari consentias. Ad cuius videlicet operis ministerium supradictum beati Aegidii abbatem [sc. Odilonem] coopertorem predestinavimus.* » DHA nr. 109.

¹² Szovák 1996, 24–26.

prononcer l'excommunication d'Henri V lors du concile d'Esztergom de 1112.¹³ Trois années plus tard un certain *Dietrich* arriva en Hongrie pour le même but.¹⁴

Le devoir des deux légats d'Alexandre III, Julius et Petrus de Mizo (1159/1160-1161) était principalement l'approbation du pape contre Victor IV.¹⁵ L'historiographie hongroise considère la décennie s'étendant de 1159 à 1169 une « époque des concordats ». ¹⁶ La date du compromis de 1159 est fort contestable. Il s'agit ici plutôt d'une acte diplomatique, de l'approbation d'Alexandre III (1159-1181) contre l'antipape Victor IV. Malgré l'élection de Rolandus Bandinelli, faite par la majorité des cardinaux, l'empereur Frédéric I^{er} Barberousse nomma son propre candidat, Octavianus Monticelli, et convoqua la synode de Pavie au début de 1160 qui condamna et excommunia Alexandre III. Les représentants du roi Géza II et ceux des prélats hongrois manquaient le synode de Pavie,

¹³ Fraknói 1901, 31. Portant sur la vie et l'activité de Cunon en tant que légat de Pascal II et Callixte II. Cf. G. Schöne, *Kardinallegat Kuno, Bischof von Praeneste*, Weimar, 1857. ; K. Ruess, *Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VIII.*, (Görres-Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft im katholischen Deutschland. Sektion für Rechts- und Sozialwissenschaft 13. Heft) Paderborn, 1912. (dans ce qui suit : Ruess 1912) p. 68. ; S. Weiß, *Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten von Leo IX. bis Coelestin III.* 1049-1198, Köln-Wien, 1995. (dans ce qui suit : Weiß 1995), 61-68.

¹⁴ Fraknói 1901, 31. *Annalista Saxo*, a. d. 1115 « [...] *Ad hec quemdam cardinalem Romanum, nomine Dietricum, legatione in Pannonias functum, per nuntios ascissunt, quo etiam prescripti concilii actionem et per ipsam inperatoris [!] excommunicationem predicante, tam Adelgatus Magedaburgiensis archiepiscopus, quam ceterarum ec[c]lesiarum presules reconciliationem recipiunt. [...]* » *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* (dans ce qui suit : MGH SS) VI, 751.

¹⁵ Cf. Fraknói 1901, 32 ; W. Ohnsorge, *Die Legaten Alexanders III im ersten Jahrzehnt seines Pontifikats (1159-1169)*, Berlin 1928. (dans ce qui suit : Ohnsorge 1928) 112-116. Boso, *Liber pontificalis* « *Ad Ungaros vero [Julius] Prenestinus episcopus et [Petrus] sancti Eustachii diaconus cardinalis [missi sunt]* ». Leur lettre de recommandation à Spalato : « *Quod vos fratrem nostrum Julium Praenestinum episcopum et dilectum filium nostrum Petrum, s. Eustachii diaconum cardinalem sicut ipsi nobis insinuerunt, benigne recipere et honeste curastis pertractare* » – cités par Ohnsorge 1928, p. 112. Il est incertain que des légats soient arrivés dans les années suivant, même si le notaire de l'empereur, Burchard les nota dans son oeuvre : « *Inimicis imperii pseudocardinalibus per marchias Ungariae frequenter trans-euntibus insidias et captiones paravi* ». – cité par Ohnsorge 1928. 116. note 44. Ce dernier les identifia avec Jean d'Anagni et Albert de Morra. *Ibid.*, pp. 118-119.

¹⁶ Le texte d'une charte de 1179 reflète bien le compromis conclu : « [...] *libertates quoque, seu immunitates, iura et dignitates predictae ecclesie, a sancto Stephano rege, qui ecclesiam ipsam fundavit, concessas, que in vita sua legebantur, et ab aliis regibus indultas, usque ad tempus recolende memorie Geize regis conservatas, ratas habuit atque firmas, easque perpetuis temporibus illibatas manere sancivit; salvis libertatibus et institutionibus, que de auctoritate Romane ecclesie, per bone memorie Petrum quondam tituli sancti Laurencii in Damaso et Manfredum tituli sancte Cecilie presbyteros sancte Romane ecclesie cardinales, olim in partibus illis apostolice sedis legatos, cum assensu et voluntate praedicti regis Geize et filiorum suorum pie recordacionis Emerici [recte: Stephani III] et Bele [III] regum facte fuerant [...]* ». *Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vespreniensis – A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára ... Edita Collegio Historicorum Hungarorum Romano*, 2 vols, Budapestini 1896-1898. (dans ce qui suite: MREV).

l'antipape Victor IV envoya donc son légat, l'évêque Prague, Daniel pour recevoir l'approbation du roi hongrois.¹⁷ Alexandre III de sa part envoya aussi des légats, Petrus de Mizo, diacre-cardinal de S. Eustache et Julius, évêque-cardinal de Praeneste pour avoir la bienveillance de Géza II. Ils sont mentionnés en 1160 dans une lettre d'Alexandre III adressée au clergé et aux habitants de Spalato.¹⁸ Il est probable que Petrus de Mizo arrivât en Dalmatie déjà à la fin de 1159, il rencontrât le roi. En 1160 il disposa l'élection de l'archevêque de Spalato (Absalon). Julius de Praeneste le rejoignit là pour recevoir l'approbation d'Alexandre III de la part du roi Géza II. Cette première tentative restée infructueuse, les deux légats quittèrent la Dalmatie au cours de 1160. L'année suivante ils se retournèrent en Hongrie pour recevoir la réponse affirmative du roi. Cette deuxième légation eut pour résultat le premier concordat d'investiture. La date de celui-ci, ainsi que les délais de la présence de Petrus de Mizo et Julius de Praeneste restent pourtant obscures. Au 28 janvier 1161 Julius était encore à Anagni, tandis qu'il manquait des témoins de chartes papales entre 26 février et 24 septembre. Ainsi il devait être en Hongrie entre ces deux dates. Le plus probable est que la signature de ce premier concordat eût lieu en août 1161, car ce fut Julius qui apporta en juillet le *pallium* à l'archevêque d'Esztergom.¹⁹

Le traité de 1169 est – me semble-t-il – l'œuvre d'un autre légat d'Alexandre III, Manfredus de Lavagna, cardinal-diacre de S. Georgii ad velum aureum. Le roi, Étienne III (1162-1172) confirma de son côté le renoncement fait par son père, ainsi qu'il accepta de ne pas exercer le *ius spolii* dans le cas des églises épiscopales, et de la déposition des prévôts et des abbés des chapitres et des abbayes royaux. Un autre but des négociations du légat fut de persuader l'archevêque d'Esztergom, Lucques de bien vouloir ordonner archevêque de Kalocsa André, ancien évêque de Győr.²⁰ Le problème est que le texte de cette « *constitutio ecclesias-*

¹⁷ Fraknoi 1901, 32. Cf. *Monachi Sazavensis continuatio Cosmae*, « Daniel presul a cesare et apostolico multo sublimatus honore, excellentia quoque functus legationis apostolicae, proficiscitur ad regem Hunorum, et exinde ad propriam Pragensem pontificatus sedem anno dominicae incarnationis 1160, in omnibus auctore Deo prospere agens, regreditur ». MGH SS, IX, 161 ; *Vincenti Pragensis Annales* anno 1161, « His itaque perfectis, per diversa regna ad diversos reges, qui hoc annuntient et confirment diversi mittuntur nuntii. [...] Daniel Pragensis episcopus in Ungariam ad regem Uungarie mittitur [...] ». MGH SS, XVII, 679 ; Ohnsorge 1928, 113.

¹⁸ « Alexander episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis filiis, universo clero et populo Salonitano salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Illa devotionis sinceritas et puritatis constantia, quam circa matrem vestram, sacrosanctam Romanam ecclesiam et personam nostram habetis, in hoc evidenter apparet, quod venerabilem fratrem nostrum, Iulium, Praenestinum episcopum, et dilectum filium nostrum, Petrum, S. Eustachii diaconum cardinalem, sicut ipsi idem nobis infirmuarunt, benigne recipere, et honeste curastis pertractare. Pro tanto itaque caritatis fervore, et fidei constantia, gratiarum vobis actiones persoluentes, et sincera in Christi visceribus caritate, vos diligentes. » *Codex diplomaticus Regni Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, t. I-XI, ed. G. Fejér, Budae 1828-1844. (dans ce qui suit : Fejér) II, 160.

¹⁹ Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 32 ; Ohnsorge 1928, 114-115.

²⁰ « Quomodo venerabilem fratrem nostrum A[nndream] nunc Colocensem archiepiscopum tunc in episcopum Geuriensem electum ad mandatum nostrum sepius iteratum vel ad communicatio-

tica » fut maintenu dans le *Liber pontificalis* et *Liber censuum* dispersée parmi des textes de divers genres. Le texte est rédigé probablement par la chancellerie pontificale d'après un compromis verbal.²¹ En 1172 le roi Béla III (1172-1196) confirma de son côté le compromis de 1161.²²

Dans le dernier quart du XII^e siècle les relations diplomatiques de la Hongrie et la Papauté se relâchaient, seulement deux légats-diplomates sont connus de cette période. En 1175 fut envoyé Walter, cardinal-évêque d'Albano pour disposer l'élection de l'archevêque de Salzbourg. Menacé par Frédéric Barberousse, il l'arrangea à Győr (août 1176) en présence de l'évêque de Győr, du prévôt de Székesfehérvár et de l'abbé de Pannonhalma.²³ À la fin du siècle Jean, cardinal-évêque de Praeneste accomplit des missions diplomatiques en (et pour la) Hongrie : il négociait la préparation d'une croisade, ainsi qu'il servait d'intermédiaire entre Venise et la Hongrie lors des pourparlers de paix.²⁴

Diplomatie : interventions dans les querelles dynastiques

L'implication de la Papauté dans les affaires dynastiques hongroises est peu représentée dans les activités diplomatiques des légats pontificaux durant la période Árpádienne. Elle avait pour but, avant tout, d'assurer les intérêts et la liberté de l'église hongroise et de son clergé. La querelle acharnée entre les deux fils du roi Béla III (1172-1196), Émeric (1196-1204) et le prince André (le futur roi André II, 1205-1235) était bien inquiétante, car elle divisait les prélats hongrois. Le pape Innocent III envoya en 1200 son légat Gregorius de Crescentio Caballi Marmorei, cardinal-diacre de S. Maria in Aquiro,²⁵ pour rétablir la paix entre le roi Émeric et le prince André, ainsi que pour le « règlement des affaires du clergé hongrois », c'est-à-dire la reconciliation des prélats prenant position en faveur des

nem bone memorie M[anfredum] quindam episcopi Prenestini, tunc sancti G[eorgii] ad velum aureum diaconi cardinalis, qui in Ungaria fungebatur legationis officio, consecrare aut ordinare minime voluisti. » - d'après W. Holtzmann, « Papst Alexander III. und Ungarn », *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 6:4 (1927) (dans ce qui suit : Holtzmann 1927), 401.

²¹ Cf. Szovák 1996, 36-37 et note 58 ; Ohnsorge 1928, 122-123.

²² Holtzmann 1927, 401-403.

²³ Le légat rassura les droits de l'archevêque élu, Adalbert contre le candidat de Frédéric I^{er} introduit par force. Fraknoi 1901, 34 ; Holtzmann 1927, 423-424. ; Weiß 1995, 267. nr. 1-2.

²⁴ Szovák 1996, 39. Cf. *Die Register Innocenz' III.* Bearbeitet von O. Hageneder und A. Haidacher, Bd. I. Graz-Köln 1964 (dans ce qui suit : RI III) III, 376-377.

²⁵ Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 34-35. H. Zimmermann, *Die päpstliche Legation in der erste Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts. Vom Regierungsantritt Innozenz' III. bis zum Tode Gregors IX.* (1198-1241), Paderborn 1913 (dans ce qui suit : Zimmermann 1913) 30 n. 1, 40-41, 297. n. 6, W. Maleczek, *Papst und Kardinalskolleg von 1191 bis 1216. Die Kardinäle unter Coelestin III. und Innozenz III.* Wien 1984 (dans ce qui suit : Maleczek 1984) 90-91, 93-94, 151-153, 183-184. R. Aubert, « Grégoire de Crescentio », dans *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*. Sous la direction de Fr. Baudrillart [et alii], 29 vols, Paris 1912-2007. (dans ce qui suit : DHGE) t. 21, Paris, 1986, col. 1496., R. Aubert, « 17. Grégoire », dans DHGE t. 21, col. 1457-1458. (dans ce qui suit : Aubert, « 17. Grégoire »), Ruess 1912, 78-79.

deux adversaires²⁶. Un autre exemple est la confrontation du roi Béla IV (1235-1270) et son fils, le prince héritier²⁷ Étienne (le futur roi Étienne V, 1270-1272), qui apparaît en rapport étroit avec la concurrence dynastique entre les Árpádiens et les Przemysls (« guerre de succession de l'héritage des Babenbergs »). Les deux légats des papes Innocent IV et Urbain IV, Velasco (1253/1254, 1263) et Bernardus Rubeus Caraccioli (1254) devaient rétablir la paix entre le roi Béla IV et le prince héritier Étienne, ainsi que servir d'intermédiaire entre Béla IV et Ottakar II (1253-1278).²⁸ L'implication de la papauté dans ces querelles est toujours justifiée par la menace contre la *liberté de l'Église*, enjeu des « parties » politiques adverses.

Durant la période de 1290-1310, les relations diplomatiques du Siège Apostolique et de la Hongrie se focalisèrent sur la question de la succession au trône des Árpádiens. Comme il n'y avait pas d'héritiers masculins directs à partir de 1290, une occasion favorable s'ouvrit pour la Papauté de faire valoir le principe de la *succession légitime* d'un candidat acceptable (les Angevins dans ce cas-là) et de la *suprématie pontificale* dans les affaires séculières. Cependant, l'élite ecclésiastique et séculière hongroise, se basant sur l'idée de la *libre élection du roi*, arriva à contrecarrer les projets des papes après la mort de Ladislas IV « le Couman » (1272-1290) et celle d'André III (1290-1301).

Le cas de la légitimation de Caroberto en Hongrie montre clairement cette « confrontation juridique et idéologique ». Nicolas IV,²⁹ Boniface VIII³⁰ et Clément V devaient également faire face aux organisations politiques corporatives (*prelati et barones*) de l'extrême fin du XIII^e siècle et au régime des oligarques, et seul Clément V arriva à faire accepter Caroberto (Charles I^{er}, 1301/1308/1310-1342) en Hongrie. Les mots-clés du succès furent l'éparpillement des organisa-

²⁶ C'est la première mention d'un légat doté des pleins pouvoirs en Hongrie. *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus*, éd. G. Wenzel, Pest-Budapest, 1863-1874, (dans ce qui suit : ÁÚO) t. I, p. 88. Cf. : Fraknói 1901, 37-38 ; Zimmermann 1913, 30 ; Maleczek 1984, 91. Une autre tâche du légat fut formulée par Aubert : regagner le roi hongrois au parti des Guelfs contre les Staufens. Aubert, « 17. Grégoire ».

²⁷ Le terme technique hongrois « ifjabb király » (provenant du latin « rex iunior ») n'existe pas en français, le « roi-jeune » semble être inadéquat.

²⁸ Fraknói 1901, 69-70, 75-76. ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*. 2 vols, Romae 1859-1860. (dans ce qui suit : Theiner) I, 226-228, 242, 244. Cf. Ruess 1912, 97.

²⁹ Le légat Johannes Uggocione quitta la Hongrie sans aucun résultat après la mort de Nicolas IV (4 avril 1292). Fraknói 1901, 99-101., Theiner I, 371.

³⁰ Après la mort d'André III (14 janvier 1301) le pape Boniface VIII prit une position modeste : il n'envoya son légat, Niccolao Boccasini qu'en mai 1301. Le projet échoua par l'opposition de l'élite séculière et ecclésiastique hongroise, le légat dut - en 1303 - quitter la Hongrie sans avoir eu des résultats convenables du point de vue de la légitimation de Caroberto. Theiner I, 397-399. Fraknói 1901, 113. et n. 340, 115-116, n. 348, 350., *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia 1301-1387*, éd. J. Kristó, et al. Budapest-Szeged 1990-2007. (dans ce qui suit : AO) I, nr. 351, 417, Fejér VIII/1, 133-135.

tions politiques corporatives, la restructuration de l'élite ecclésiastique – plus favorable à Caroberto – et le manque d'unanimité politique des oligarques.³¹

Croisades, missions, hérétiques schismatiques

La participation de la Hongrie dans les croisades au sens large du terme – qu'il s'agisse des luttes pour la libération de la Terre Sainte ou des missions à faire auprès des peuples païens, hérétiques, ou bien parmi les orthodoxes « schismatiques » est aussi un thème récurrent dans les relations de la Hongrie et du Saint Siège.

Le terrain le plus spécial – dans le sens stricte et élargi du terme – des légations durant le XII^e siècle était la Dalmatie. Étendue dans l'axe de confrontation de la Hongrie, Venise et Byzance, représentant à la fois la zone frontalière du rite latin et orthodoxe et de l'hérésie, la Dalmatie était une des plus importantes territoires des relations hungaro-pontificales. La première référence est assez obscure : en 1103 *l'apocrisaire Augustin* arriva en Dalmatie pour y « propager la justice ». Le but de sa légation n'est pas exactement identifiable, il pouvait être en relation avec la politique ecclésiastique du roi Coloman.³² En 1136, juste après la reconquête de la Dalmatie, le roi Béla II (1131-1141) fit élir archevêque de Spalato son propre candidat, Gaudius. La consécration faite par l'archevêque d'Esztergom provoqua un long débat avec le pape Innocent II qui réclama la lèse des ses droit et refusa d'envoyer le *pallium* pendant trois ans. Enfin, en 1139 le pape con-

³¹ Theiner I, 415-421, *Acta legationis cardinalis Gentilis – Gentilis bíbornok magyarországi követségének okiratai 1307-1311*, (reprint) Budapest 2003, Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia – Vatikáni magyar okirattár I/1 ; I, 112-119, 303-306, AO II, nr. 482., 494, Gy. Rácz, « Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék », [Les rois Angevins et le Saint Siège] dans Zombori 1996, 58. Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 121. Voir plus détaillé : G. Kiss « Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie au temps des rois Angevins (1298-1311) », dans *Actes du colloque international Diplomacy in The Countries of The Angevin Dynasty in The Thirteenth-Fourteenth Centuries – La diplomatie des états Angevins aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, ed. N.-Y. Tonnerre, Z. Kordé, I. Petrovics, Szeged 2010, 101-116.

³² Seulement la disposition du débat de l'évêque de Belgrad, Bonus et de l'abbaye de St. Jean est connue. « Anno ab incarnatione millesimo, centesimo tertio, indictione IV. regnante Alexio imperatore, ego Augustinus, S. Romanae Sedis cardinalis, missus a domino papa Paschali in Dalmatiam et Ungariam apocrisiarius, adiutorio omnipotentis adiutus, et defensione Apostolorum Petri et Pauli circumtectus, et zelo iustitiae accinctus ad propagandam per Dalmatinas ciuitates iustitiam ea, quae invenimus in eis exstirpanda, exstirpavimus, et quae plantanda erant, plantavimus, et quae corrigenda erant, canonice correximus [...] » Fejér II. 37-38, pourtant, la reprise d'un mandat général dans le texte reflète une autorisation générale. Cf. : Fraknoi 1901, p. 31., Weiß 1995, p. 57. Concernant la personne d'Augustin cardinal-prêtre de SS. Quattro Coronati voir : R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms 1049-1130*. (Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Institut in Rom 48.) Tübingen, 1977., p. 203. ; L. Waldmüller, *Die Synoden in Dalmatien, Kroatien und Ungarn. Von der Völkerwanderung bis zum Ende der Arpaden* (1311), Padernborn – München – Wien – Zürich, 1987. (Konziliengeschichte, Hrsg. von W. Brandmüller, Reihe A: Darstellungen) (dans ce qui suit : Waldmüller 1987) p. 137. note 53., M. Th. Disdier, 'Augustin 4.', dans *DHGE* 5 (1930), col. 419. Waldmüller supposa un synode tenu par le légat.

firma Gaudius par l'intermédiaire de son légat, Ubaldus.³³ Il semble, que dans ce cas-là le droit de patronage du roi fut contesté par le pape, ce qui s'inscrivait bien dans les querelles d'investiture thématiques les relations hungaro-pontificales de l'époque.³⁴ À partir des années 1160 l'importance de la Dalmatie s'agrandit remarquablement dans la diplomatie pontificale due au croisement des problèmes politiques et rituels. D'une part les avancements de Byzance dans la région menaçaient bien l'église dalmatienne, d'autre part les efforts des rois hongrois à reconquérir la Dalmatie évoquaient les menaces représentées par l'exercice du droit de patronage des Árpádiens. Il n'est point frappant donc, que Petrus de Mizo se tracassait bien du renforcement de l'église dalmatienne au gré du pape Alexandre III. À la suite des débats surgis autour de la personne de l'archevêque de Spalato, Absalon, nommé par le roi Géza II, le légat nomma en 1161 son propre candidat, Pierre, l'ancien évêque de Narni.³⁵ Quelques années plus tard,³⁶

³³ « *Innocentius, seruus seruorum Dei, Gaudio, venerabili fratri Salonitano archiepiscopo, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Sicuti B. Gregorii testatur auctoritas, et tam veterum, quam modernorum gestorum monumenta declarant, examinatio et consecratio Salonitani archiepiscopi, ex antiqua institutione, ad Romanum pontificem specialiter spectaret. Quo circa in sanctam Romanam ecclesiam grauiter deliquisse, et clauis B. Petri ausu temerario euacuae voluisse, dignosceris, dum sprete dignitate sedis apostolicae, ad aliam prouinciam conuolasti; et contra veterum consuetudinem a Strigoniensi archiepiscopo consecrationem suscipere attentasti. Licet ergo vehementer excesseris; licet contra stimulum calcitrare molitus sis; quia tamen dilectus filius noster, Bela, Ungariae rex, pro te multoties apud sedem apostolicam per litteras et nuncios intercessit; ipsius tandem precibus condescendimus; et per dilectum filium nostrum Ubaldum diaconum cardinalem, virum siquidem honestum, et litterarum peritia eruditum, fraternitati tuae pallium pontificale, officii plenitudinem, signum humilitatis, et iustitiae, destinamus; ut videlicet eo his diebus utaris, quibus in ecclesiae tuae scriptis authenticis continetur. Tua itaque interest, ita te erga B. Petrum devotum, et humilem in omnibus exhibere, ita te in eius obsequio exercere, et praeceptis Apostolicis obedire, ut hac gratia dignior valeas inueniri, et nos de tuae actionis studiis exultare possimus. Praeterea episcopos per Dalmatiam constitutos suffraganeos, quibus Salona tempore suo rutilando utebatur, sanctae Spalatinae ecclesiae, ubi corpus S. Domnii, discipuli B. Petri, requieuit, cum omni reuerentia obedire sancimus; quem unum totius Dalmatiae metropolitanum in Salonitana ecclesia fore scimus, iuxta quod in decretis nostris comperimus. Item, quia per vestras litteras conquesti estis de suffraganeis, recusantibus venire ad concilium sanctae Salonitanae ecclesiae metropolitanae; nos ita statuimus, ut in Dalmatia nullo alio in loco synodus, praeter in vestra metropolitana, celebretur; et ibidem omnes suffraganei praefatae ecclesiae Salonitanae, more solito, consecrentur.* » Fejér II, 113-115. La personne d'Ubaldus est bien intéressante. Cet Ubaldus était le fils d'Orlando Allucingoli, né à Lucca. Il était légat d'Innocent II en 1142-1143 à Piacenza et à Bibbiano, et en 1144 à Vercelli, à Novara et à Milan, accompagné du cardinal-prêtre Guido de S. Grisogono. Cf. Weiß 1995, 145-146, 149-150. En 1138 il était cardinal-diacre de S. Adriano, à partir de 1144 cardinal-prêtre de S. Prassede, puis, en 1158 cardinal-évêque d'Ostie et de Velletri. En 1181 il fut élu pape sous le nom Lucius III, mort en 1185. Cf. U. Schmidt, « Lucius III. » dans *Lexikon des Mittelalters* V (1991), 1262-1263; L. Vones, « Lucius III, » dans Ph. Levillain, éd., *Dictionnaire historique de la papauté*, Paris 1994, 1062-1064.

³⁴ Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 31, Waldmüller 1987, 145-146, Szovák 1996, 30-31.

³⁵ Ohnsorge 1928, 110-112. Cf. Weiß 1995, 240-241. et nr. 1., Szovák 1996, 36. En 1166 Petrus de Mizo reçut le titre du cardinalat de S. Laurentii in Damaso, puis en 1168 il fut

Alexandre III essaya de renforcer la situation de l'église dalmate par l'intermédiaire de son légat, Albertus de Morra.³⁷ En 1167, par la suite de la vacance de siège archiépiscopal de Spalato, il fut élu archevêque, qu'il refusa, car le pape ne confirma pas cette élection et Alexandre III nomma Gérard, son chapelain.³⁸ La représentation pontificale en Dalmatie fut maintenue ensuite, jusqu'en 1180 par la personne de l'archevêque de Spalato.³⁹

L'une des tâches primordiales des légats pontificaux envoyés en Hongrie dans la première moitié du XIII^e siècle était d'encourager la participation active des rois hongrois dans l'oeuvre des croisades⁴⁰ et des missions lancées contre les hérétiques et schismatiques du Nord des Balkans. Neuf légats furent autorisés du-

envoyé de nouveau en Dalmatie, probablement en corrélation avec les débats surgis autour du pontificat de l'archevêque de Spalato, Gérard. Ohnsorge 1928, 121-122. Cf. Thomas de Spalato, *Chronicon*, MGH SS, XXIX, 573.

³⁶ Il est peu vraisemblable qu'Albertus fût identique à un des légats mentionnés par Burchard, notaire de l'empereur Frédéric Barberousse : « *Inimicis imperii pseudocardinalibus per marchias Ungariae frequenter transeuntibus insidias et captiones paravi* » – cité par Ohnsorge 1928, 116. note 44. Ce dernier les identifia avec Jean d'Anagni et Albert de Morra. *Ibid*, 118-119.

³⁷ Concernant la presonne d'Albert Morra (*vers 1105-1110-†17. décembre 1187) cardinal-diacre de S. Adriani (1156-1158), puis cardinal-prêtre de S. Lorenzi in Lucina, le futur Grégoire VIII (1187) voir : B. Roberg, « Gregor VIII, » dans *Lexikon des Mittelalters* IV (1989), 1671 ; L. Vones, « Gregory VIII, » dans Ph. Levillain, éd., *Dictionnaire historique de la papauté*, Paris 1994, 749-750; Weiß 1995, 249-252.

³⁸ Thomas de Spalato, *Chronicon* : « *Vachante autem tunc temporis ecclesia Spalatensi, quidam chardinalis, vir magne auctoritatis et eximie onestatis, per totum Ungariae regnum officium legationis fungebatur. [...] Factum est autem, ut eo tempore congregaretur clerus Spalatine ecclesie pro archiepiscopo eligendo. Et tandem premisso tractatu de electione cuiusdam, in archiepiscopum, ut moris est, omnia vota in personam eiusdem cardinalis concorditer conveniunt. [...]* » MGH SS, XXIX, 573. Pour la négation du pape voir: JL nr. 11361 « *super eo quod [...] clerus et populus Spalatensis te in pastore suum voluerunt assumere [...] nulla ratione consentiremus* ». Cf. Ohnsorge 1928, 109, 118-121; Szovák 1996, 36.

³⁹ Ohnsorge 1928, 109, 118-121, Szovák 1996, 36. En 1180 le roi Béla III demanda au clergé et au peuple de Spalato d'accepter son candidat, Pierre, mais ils le fit savoir au pape Alexandre III qui reclama vivement les droits du Siège Apostolique. Enfin, le roi réussit à faire élire Pierre, d'après une charte royale de 1183. Cf. *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica*. I-II/1. ed. E. Szentpétery, I. Borsa, Budapest 1923-1987 (dans ce qui suit : RA) nr. 138.

⁴⁰ Le premier roi hongrois qui s'engagea personnellement dans une croisade fut André II, accomplissant la promesse de son grand-père et de son père. En 1217 le pape Honorius III fit savoir au roi André II qu'il lui enverrait Ugolinus de Segni pour négocier l'affaire de la croisade du roi. L. Solymosi, « Egyházi-politikai viszonyok a pápai hegemonia idején », [Relations ecclésiastiques et politiques à l'époque de l'hégémonie da la Papauté] dans *Magyarország és a Szentszék*, 50. Cf. Theiner I, 4-6 ; P. Pressutti, *Regesta Honorii papae III.*, 2 vols, Romae 1888. (dans ce qui suit : Pressutti 1888) nr. 291., *Regesta pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCCCIV*. Ed. A. Potthast, 2 vols, Berolini 1874-1875. (Neudruck : Graz, 1957), (dans ce qui suit : Potthast) nr. 5440 ; Fraknoi 1901, 46, 51, Zimmermann 1913, 73 ; Aubert, « Grégoire IX ».

rant les quatre premières décennies du XIII^e siècle pour renforcer et faire avancer cette oeuvre, en exploitant bien sûr les tentatives d'expansion hongroises vers les Balkans.

Les deux « politiques » se concentraient surtout sur la Bulgarie, la Serbie et la Bosnie. La légation de *Leo Brancalensis* (février - novembre 1204)⁴¹ préparée par celle de Johannes Casamaris⁴² (1202-1204)⁴³ avait pour but l'élargissement des frontières de la Chrétienté Latine en Bulgarie, tout comme dans le cas de Gregorius de Crestentio Caballi Marmorei (1207-1208/1209?).⁴⁴ Mais, par la suite des succès éphémères, dans les années 1230, c'était l'idée de la croisade en Bulgarie qui s'imposait. Mais la légation de *Salvi*, évêque de Perugia, n'eut pas de résultat et la croisade fut annulée en 1237 et en 1238⁴⁵.

La question de l'hérésie « bosniaque » préoccupait tout autant les papes de l'époque. Les activités des légats envoyés entre 1221 et 1243 s'étendaient surtout au renforcement de l'évêché de Bosnie, qui impliquait de plus en plus la coopération de l'Église hongroise, aboutissant enfin à l'intégration de l'évêché à la hiérarchie ecclésiastique hongroise (1247, Kalocsa).⁴⁶

⁴¹ La mission du légat fut le couronnement de Kaloïan et la confirmation de l'archevêque de Trnovo, Basilius. Fejér II, 425-426, 432-435, 439-440 ; Potthast, nr. 2143, 2144, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2290, 6183, 6383, 6363, 6366, 6462 ; Theiner, I, 52-53, 56-58 ; Fraknoi 1901, p. 39-41 ; Ruess 1912, 70. ; Zimmermann 1913, 36 ; Maleczek 1984, 129-130, 137-139.

⁴² Chapelain du pape, évêque de Forcone (1204) et de Perugia (1207-1230). Il dut quitter la Hongrie par la suite de la contre-manoeuvre du roi Émeric. Maleczek 1984, 138.

⁴³ Fraknoi 1901, 39 ; Fejér II, 439. Cf. Maleczek 1984, 138.

⁴⁴ Sa légation avait - au moins d'après certains auteurs - pour but de « regagner » les schismatiques de Halitsch, ainsi que l'extirpation de l'hérésie des Balkans. Ruess 1912, 78-79. ; Zimmermann 1913, 40-41 ; Fejér, III, 78, 81-82 ; RA, nr. 241., *Monumenta Ecclesiae Strigoniensis*, 2 vols. ed. F. Knauz, Strigonii 1874-1882, 3 vols. ed. C. L. Dedek, Strigonii 1924 (dans ce qui suit : MES) I, 192, Potthast, nr. 3196. Cf. Aubert, « 17. Grégoire » ; Maleczek 1984, 91.

⁴⁵ Theiner I, 155, 160-161, 164-167, 170 ; Fraknoi 1901, 62-64. ; *Les registres de Grégoire IX. Recueil des bulles de ce pape publiées et analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican par Lucien Auvray*, 4 vols, Paris 1890-1955, (dans ce qui suit : RGIX) nr. 4056, 4058-4064. Cf. Zimmermann 1913, 128.

⁴⁶ Il s'agit des légations d'Accontius (1221-1225) qui fut envoyé déjà en 1219 pour collecter le *vicesima*, de Jacques de Pecorarie (1232-1234), de Posa (simple légat en 1234, puis, à partir de 1238 évêque de Bosnie et légat de plein-pouvoir jusqu'en 1241), de l'évêque de Vác (1243) et de Gilles, chapelain du pape (1228-1235, préparation de la fondation de l'évêché missionnaire de Szerém (Sirmie, 1229)). Selon Zimmermann, Posa « hérita » de l'autorisation de son prédécesseur, Johannes Waldeshausen et de Jacques de Pecorarie. Zimmermann 1913, 73. nr. 2, 94-95, 109-110, 116, 139, nr. 2 ; Theiner I, 28-31, 55, 80, 87-88, 92, 106-107, 111-114, 124, 134, 169, Pressutti 1888, nr. 3242-43, 3252, 3594, 3601, 3846, 4455 ; Potthast, nr. 6611, 6612, 6618, 6725, 6729, 6802, 7064, 8183, 8234, 8348, 8993, 9061, 9272-9274, 9374, 9460, 9968, 10691, 10693, 11095 ; Ruess 1912, 71. et n. 6., *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae ac Slavoniae. Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, ed. T. Smičiklas, 15 vols, Zagrabiae 1904-1934, III, 229, IV, 64 ; *A Pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-rend története*, [Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît de Pannonhalma] ed. L. Erdélyi, P. Sörös, 12 vols, Budapest 1902-1916, (dans ce qui

Parallèlement, la papauté faisait beaucoup d'efforts pour la conversion des Coumans : la création d'une province hongroise des Frères Prêcheurs, l'autorisation légataire de l'archevêque d'Esztergom Robert avait pour but la mise en fonction de l'évêché des Coumans (1227/1229).⁴⁷

*À la charnière de la diplomatie et du gouvernement d'église :
les conflits des séculiers et le clergé*

Durant le XIII^e siècle l'état catastrophique du pays, c'est-à-dire le conflit entre l'élite séculière et ecclésiastique ainsi que le roi donna naissance à des dispositions fondamentales – mais on le sait, peu respectées – des légats : *Jacques de Pecorarie* (1232–1234) et *Philippe*, évêque de Fermo (1279–1281).

Le 31 juillet 1227 Grégoire IX autorisa Robert, archevêque d'Esztergom, à exercer un pouvoir plein de légat en vue de gérer la mission de conversion auprès des Coumans. Entre-temps, il se mit en conflit avec le roi André II pour les vexations des droits et des privilèges du clergé hongrois. Comme ses efforts restèrent infructueux, le pape envoya en 1232 Jacques de Pecorarie pour faire accepter au roi un traité garantissant les droits et les privilèges des ecclésiastiques (traité de Bereg) : 1) exclusion des juifs et des musulmans de l'administration financière royale, interdiction de tenir des esclaves chrétiens, 2) privilège de commerce du sel aux établissements religieux, remboursement, 3) privilège d'impôt, 4) *privilegium fori*. Le traité restant lettre morte, le légat essaya de prendre garantie du prince-héritier Béla (futur roi Béla IV), sans aucun résultat. Malgré la fidélité des prélats hongrois (synode de 1233) Jacques de Pecorarie n'arriva pas à convaincre le roi de respecter le traité, il quitta la Hongrie en mars 1234. Pendant son séjour il prit, bien sûr, des décisions dans les affaires des églises hongroises aussi et il s'efforça aussi de soutenir les missions contre les hérétiques.⁴⁸

Un bon demi-siècle plus tard fut envoyé Philippe, cardinal-évêque de Fermo pour arranger la situation perturbée du royaume hongrois : 1) normaliser les relations des Coumans et du roi, 2) régler et améliorer les mœurs et les coutumes du clergé hongrois. Le légat fut envoyé par Jean XXI au 28 septembre 1275, mais il n'y arriva qu'en 1279, car le roi hongrois refusa de l'accueillir. Le légat arriva en vain à octroyer au roi les « lois des Coumans » (23 juin et au 10 août 1279), leur mise en vigueur subit un long retard par la suite de l'opposition du roi qui alla même jusqu'à insulter le légat (arrestation, fin 1279 – mars 1280). Sans avoir réus-

suit : PRT) I, 730 ; RGIX, nr. 1008, 1096, 1377, 1498–1500, 1806, 1932, 2129, 4286, 4691, 4693–4697, Fraknoi 1901, 52 ; Almási 1989, ici : p. 62.

⁴⁷ RGIX, nr. 139, 185–187. ; Fraknoi 1901, 51.

⁴⁸ Fejér III/2, 319–326, 346–348. ; Theiner I, 106–107, 111–117, 121, 123–124, 126–128, 134. ; PRT I, 730 ; RGIX, nr. 139, 561, 830, 851, 1008, 1096, 1377, 1498–1500, 1749, 1925–1927, 1932, 1969, 2129, 2322. ; Potthast, nr. 8993, 9061, 9272–9274, 9374, 9460–9461. Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 52–58. ; Zimmermann 1913, 109–110 ; Almási 1989, 62.

si dans ce domaine, le légat quitta la Hongrie (juin 1281) pour la Pologne où s'étendait aussi sa légation.⁴⁹

Activités juridiques ecclésiastiques : gouvernement d'église

L'aspect juridique des relations de la Hongrie et du Saint Siègle est aussi reflété par les décisions des affaires internes de l'église hongroise prises par des légats pontificaux. En 1009 un légat, nommé Azo coopéra à la fondation de l'évêché de Pécs.⁵⁰ Sa présence est due à l'achèvement de la première phase de l'organisation ecclésiastique (997/1001-1009), accomplie par une autorisation papale. Un autre exemple de cet aspect juridique est la participation active de la papauté dans les querelles de juridiction des archevêques d'Esztergom et de Kalocsa, éclatées autour de la primauté et des droits spéciaux revendiqués par ce dernier. Le pape Alexandre III, instruit par l'intermédiaire de son légat Manfredus de Lavagna, cardinal-diacre de S. Georgii ad velum aureum, essaya de calmer les conflits de deux prélats, de Lucques d'Esztergom et d'André de Kalocsa (1179-1180/1181).⁵¹

Teobald, cardinal-évêque d'Ostie et de Velletri séjourna en Hongrie entre 1184 et 1186, il disposa dans l'affaire de l'abbé de Pannonhalma⁵² et de l'évêque de Győr, et confirma la donation de l'évêque de Veszprém en faveur de son chapitre cathédral.⁵³ Gregorius de Sancto Apostolo, cardinal-diacre de S. Maria in porticu

⁴⁹ Les activités, le sort aventureux du légat sont très bien décrits dans l'*Österreichische Reimchronik* d'Ottokar. *MGH Scriptorum qui vernacula lingua usi sunt*, t. V, pars I, Hannoverae, 1890, p. 322-329. Le texte des « lois des Coumans » voir : RA, nr. 3004. Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 80-81 et nr. 252, 83-90 ; Theiner I, 327-328, 334, 342, 345-347, 350 ; MES II, 92, 97, Ruess 1912, 96-97.

⁵⁰ « [...] nos cum consensu sanctissimi apostolici et in presencia eius nuncii Azonis episcopi [...] ». DHA 58, nr. 9/I. Azo fut l'évêque d'Ostie et bibliothécaire du Siège Apostolique : 1013, « datum per manus Azzoni episcopi sancte Ostiensis ecclesie et bibliothecario sancte apostolice sedis ». H. Zimmermann, Harald, éd., *Papsturkunden 896-1046*, Vol. I, (896-996), Vol. II, (996-1046). Wien 1988-1989, II, 917-918.

⁵¹ En 1179 Alexandre III admonesta Béla III d'avoir abjuré le compromis de 1169 lorsqu'il fit déposer l'archêque de Kalocsa (André) et le prévôt du chapitre collégial de Székesfehérvár (Grégoire) sous prétexte de lèse-majesté. Cependant l'archevêque d'Esztergom excommunia André de Kalocsa, parce que ce dernier aurait usurpé ses droits de juridiction. Lucques d'Esztergom refusa de retirer l'excommunication et la bénédiction du roi ce qui résulta l'admonestation d'Alexandre III. Le pape ordina enfin au clergé hongrois d'accepter la personne d'André, et essaya de persuader même le roi. Szovák 1996, 38-39. « Quomodo venerabilem fratrem nostrum A[ndream] nunc Colocensem archiepiscopum tunc in episcopum Geuriensem electum ad mandatum nostrum sepius iteratum vel ad communicationem bone memorie M[anfredum] quondam episcopi Prenestini, tunc sancti G[eorgii] ad velum aureum diaconi cardinalis, qui in Ungaria fungebatur legationis officio, consecrare aut ordinare minime voluisti » - d'après Holtzmann 1927, 401-403.

⁵² « Theobaldus, Dei gratia Hostiensis et Velletrensis episcopus, Apostolice Sedis in Ungaria legatus [...] ». PRT I, 611.

⁵³ « Theobaldus, Dei gratia Hostiensis et Velletrensis episcopus, Apostolice Sedis in Ungaria legatus [...] ». MREV I, 4-5.

(1188–1202) vint en Hongrie en 1188–1189, puis en 1192.⁵⁴ Il disposa dans deux affaires primordiales : 1) en 1189 il décida la querelle éclatée entre l'évêque de Transylvanie et le prévôt de Szeben autour de la juridiction de l'évêque,⁵⁵ 2) en 1192 il participa au procès de canonisation du roi Ladislas I^{er} et disposa le débat de l'évêque et le chapitre de Trau.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Sa première légation durait probablement de 1188 à 1189, lorsqu'il décida le débat de l'évêque de Transylvanie et du prévôt de Szeben. Cf. la note suivante ! Certains auteurs estiment qu'il n'était en Hongrie qu'en 1192, lors de la canonisation de Ladislas I^{er}. Fraknoi 1901, 34–35., Maleczek 1984, 93. Cependant, le diplôme du pape Célestin III de 1191 confirma la charte de Grégoire par les mots suivants : « [...] *dilectus filius noster Gregorius sanctae Mariae in porticu diaconus Cardinalis, tunc apostolicae sedis legatus* [...] » ce qui prouve que ce dernier quitta la Hongrie avant 1191. Sa deuxième mission fut probablement en 1192. Son nom manque des chartes pontificales entre 2 janvier 1192 et 18 janvier 1193. Entre-temps il participa au procès de canonisation de Ladislas I^{er}, et disposa le débat de l'évêque et le chapitre de Trau. Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 34–35 ; Maleczek 1984, 93. et note 253 ; RI III, 376. note 4 ; Fejér II, 279–281. Sa personne est souvent confondu avec Gregorius de Crestentio Caballi Marmorei qui séjourna en Hongrie à l'extrême fin du siècle. P. ex. Szovák 1996, 39–40. Cf. : la Chronique de Thomas de Spalato, MGH SS, XXIX, 575.

⁵⁵ « *Gregorius de sancto Apostolo, Dei gratia sanctae Mariae in porticu diaconus cardinalis, Apostolicae Sedis legatus* [...] *Cunctis igitur fidelibus volumus notum fieri, quod cum occasione huius verbi, desertum, quod verbum est in privilegio gloriosi et illustris domini regis Belae, et nostro ad preces eiusdem regis impetrato a nobis et obtento super constitutione praepositurae Ultrasylvaniae, quam fecimus, cum prius officium legationis gessimus in Hungaria, questio esset orta inter venerabilem fratrem nostrum A. Ultrasylvanum episcopum et dilectum amicum nostrum P. praepositum Cibiniensem* [...] *quaestio eadem ad dominum papam fuisset delata, et inde ad nos remissa, utpote ad eum cui interpretatio praefati verbi domini regis, mente et voluntate explorata, deberet esse certissima. Praefatus illustris et gloriosus rex ad interrogationem nostram hanc interpretationem Vesprii in praesentia magnatum suorum promulgavit, quod non fuit eius intentionis tempore constitutionis praepositurae, nec postea, quod alii Flandrenses praeposito essent subditi, nisi qui tunc tantummodo habitabant in deserto, quod sanctae recordationis G[eisa] pater suus Flandrensibus concesserat, et in eodem futuris temporibus essent habitaturi. Nos vero idem cum domino rege sentientes, et eandem interpretationem habentes in animo, praedictum verbum sic interpretamur, quod de nullis aliis Flandrensibus intelleximus, nec alios praepositurae supposuimus, nisi duntaxat illos, qui tempore, quo ipsam praeposituram constituimus, in illo tantum habitabant, et erant habitaturi deserto, quod G[eisa] rex Flandrensibus prioribus concessit. Et ut haec nostra et Domini regis interpretatio omni tempore plenum robur et firmam stabilitatem obtineat, has inde litteras scribi mandavimus, et sigillo nostro fecimus sigillari.* » Fejér II, 250–251.

⁵⁶ RI III, 376. note 4., L'affaire de Trau : « *Praeterea, quod venerabilis frater noster G[regorius] de sancto Apostolo Sanctae Mariae in porticu Cardinalis super duobus perperis laudum, uno in Pascha, alio in Natali Domini persolvendo; super prandio in festo Beati Laurentii; et super coena et mandato in sacratissima Iouis die, communi capitulo exhibendis in persona Episcopi, et successorum eius constituit, ratum haberi volumus, et inconvulsae stabilitatis robore decernimus esse subnixum.* [...] *Datum Spalati Anno ab incarnationis Domini MCLXXXII indictione IV., XVI. Kal. Maii Apostolatus Coelestini III. anno secundo Gregorio de Sancto Apostolo tunc fungente legationis officio in regno Hungariae, serenissimo rege Bela eiusdem Hungariae, nec non Croatiae, Dalmatiae Ramaeque feliciter imperante* [...] » Fejér II, 279–281.

Les relations entre le Siège Apostolique et la Hongrie devinrent de plus en plus denses durant la première moitié du XIII^e siècle. L'ampleur de celles-ci est due au fait que les ecclésiastiques hongrois recherchaient volontiers l'aide du Saint Siège dans leurs procès internes et dans les conflits survenus entre le clergé et les séculiers. Par conséquent, le nombre des actes juridiques pris par des légats pontificaux augmentait d'une façon surprenante.⁵⁷ En plus, au milieu du XIII^e siècle la volonté normalisatrice des papes est explicitement détectable en Hongrie dans les actes de juridictions des légats (Robert, archevêque d'Esztergom (1227-1234), Jacques de Pecorarie (1232-1234)) sanctionnant l'atteinte aux droits fondamentaux du clergé hongrois dont l'exemple illustre est le traité de Bereg (20 août 1233).⁵⁸

La deuxième moitié de ce siècle montre une baisse importante de ce point de vue, quelques actes juridiques seulement étant connus.⁵⁹ Cependant, les activités de Philippe, cardinal-évêque de Fermo (1275/1279-1281) peuvent être distinguées. À côté de ses activités diplomatiques, il « se lança » particulièrement dans la législation et la juridiction. Outre les « lois coumanes », c'est lui qui a convoqué en 1279 le concile de Buda qui s'efforça d'améliorer les mœurs et les coutumes du clergé hongrois, profondément imprégné par les débordements séculiers : interdiction du concubinage, respect du célibat, réforme des règles des ordres religieux, renforcement du principe de l'élection canonique, etc. De plus, les chartes

⁵⁷ On est mal renseigné sur les activités juridiques des légats pontificaux durant les deux premières décennies du XIII^e siècle. Les légations de Gregorius de Crescentio Caballi Marmorei (1200, 1207-1208/1209) avaient plutôt un caractère diplomatique. Un seul acte juridique de Gregorius est connu : la confirmation de l'archevêque de Kalocsa, Berthold. Conrad d'Urach fut envoyé en 1225 par Honorius III pour mener des négociations avec le roi André II, l'Ordre Teutonique et l'évêque de Transylvanie sur les droits d'ordinaire de ce dernier. Est aussi peu identifiable le but de la « légation » du sous-diacre et chapelain du pape, Gilles. Ses activités juridiques (entre 1228 et 1231) font allusion plutôt à l'exercice d'un pouvoir de juge délégué du pape (procès de l'abbaye bénédictine de Pannonhalma). Seules les négociations sur l'érection de l'évêché de Szerém (Sirmie) ressemblent à une acte juridique du légat. ÁÚO I, 88-89 ; Fejér III/1, 53, 55. ; Fraknoi 1901, 44, 50, 52 ; Theiner I, 58-59, 80, 87, 92, 107 ; MREV I, 79, 83, 98 ; Zimmermann 1913, 83, 116. ; J.-M. Canivez, « 38. Conrad d'Urach », dans *DHGE*, 13 (1953), col. 504-507 ; R. Aubert, « Konrad d'Urach » dans *DHGE*, 29 (2007), col. 606 ; Maleczek 1984, 171. Cf. Aubert, « 17. Grégoire ».

⁵⁸ Fejér III/2, 319-326, 346-348 ; Theiner I, 106-107, 111-117, 121, 123-124, 126-128, 134 ; PRT I, 730 ; RGIX, nr. 139, 561, 830, 851, 1008, 1096, 1377, 1498-1500, 1749, 1925-1927, 1932, 1969, 2129, 2322 ; Potthast, nr. 8993, 9061, 9272-9274, 9374, 9460-9461. Cf. Fraknoi 1901, 52-58. ; Zimmermann 1913, 109-110 ; Almási 1989, 62.

⁵⁹ En 1241 Johannes de Civitella fut envoyé en principe pour inviter le roi et les prélats au concile général, mais il prit aussi des dispositions pour quelques affaires du clergé hongrois (inquisition auprès de l'évêque de Csanád, élection du prévôt de Székesfehérvár. En 1264 est arrivé Valter, chapelain du pape Clément IV pour arranger l'élection de l'évêque de Zagreb. En 1266 Fra Eneco fut mandaté pour gérer l'inquisition auprès de l'évêque de Pécs, Job. Fraknoi 1901, 64, 77-78 ; Theiner I, 178, 262, 288, Zimmermann 1913, 133 ; RGIX, nr. 5364, 5380.

et les actes judiciaires ayant survécu témoignent de ses activités très développées en matière de juridiction (par exemple à propos de l'élection de l'archevêque d'Esztergom, de l'évêque de Várad, ou du prévôt de la collégiale de Szepes).⁶⁰

Conclusion

La complexité des activités des représentants de la Papauté envoyés en Hongrie durant les XI^e-XIII^e siècles se voit clairement malgré les enjambements des rôles multipliés accomplis par ces légats pontificaux. Pourtant, quelques sujets majeurs peuvent être abordés.

Le premier, le plus général, est la *diplomatie*, dont les axes principaux sont :

- 1) le soutien politique des papes réformateurs (Urbain II, Alexandre III) lors de la querelle des investitures, sans avoir mis en œuvre la réforme dans tous ses aspects (Teuzo, Odilon, Cunon, Julien, Petrus de Mizo, Manfredus de Lavagna) ;
- 2) l'implication dans les querelles dynastiques (Béla III, Émeric/André, Béla IV/Étienne le Jeune, succession des Babenbergs, Árpádiens/Angevins) ;
- 3) les croisades, les missions, la lutte contre les hérétiques et schismatiques (Dalmatie, Balkans [Bosnie, Serbie, Bulgarie], Coumans).

Un autre terrain majeur est la *zone charnière* entre la *diplomatie* et le *gouvernement d'église*. Il y en a deux exemples célèbres : la légation de Jacques de Pecorarie (1232-1234) et celle de Philippe de Fermo (1279-1281).

Le troisième terrain est l'*activité proprement ecclésiastique*, qui comprend bien entendu les activités organisatrices d'église, ainsi que les activités normalisatrices et judiciaires des légats (Manfredus de Lavagna, Téobald, Gregorius de Sancto Apostolo, Conrad d'Urach, Gregorius de Crescentio Caballi Marmorei, Gilles, Jacques de Pecorarie, Johannes de Civitella, Valter, Eneco, Philippe, évêque de Fermo).

Il est évident, surtout d'après ce résumé inévitablement trop général, qu'il reste beaucoup à faire pour combler les lacunes – dans certains cas, j'oserais dire les abîmes – bio-prosopographiques et compléter les connaissances portant sur les formes et la nature des représentations pontificales.

⁶⁰ Les activités, le sort aventureux du légat sont très bien décrits dans l'*Österreichische Reimchronik* d'Ottokar. *MGH Scriptorum qui vernacula lingua usi sunt*, V/ I, Hannoverae 1890, 322-329. Le texte des « lois des Coumans » voir : RA, nr. 3004. Cf. Fraknói 1901, 80-81 et nr. 252, 83-90 ; Theiner I, 327-328, 334, 342, 345-347, 350 ; MES II, 92, 97 ; Ruess 1912, 96-97.

Hungary and the Second Crusade*

ZSOLT HUNYADI



In honorem J. W.

The aim of the present study is to survey and analyze the role played by Hungary during the Second Crusade and through this scholarly goal it is to bridge the gap which can be observed in Hungarian historiography.

The historiography of the Crusades as far as Hungary is concerned has recently been accomplished by Attila Bárány.¹ Bárány dedicated considerable attention to the works² of Pál Gerő Bozsóky, whose contribution to the historiography of the crusades is profound, albeit somewhat sentimental and apologetic on behalf of the Church. Notwithstanding the fact that it is not a scholarly monograph in *stricto sensu* since there are no references given at all either to sources or other secondary works. At the same time, Bárány reflected only briefly upon the studies published by András Borosy,³ however, he proved to be much more objective, that is he avoided taking sides, in his appraisal of Hungary's involvement in the crusades than Bozsóky. Bárány emphasized that Bozsóky was the first scholar to study systematically the primary sources and the secondary literature of the crusades. As a matter of fact, this is also true for Borosy. Both historians were very much aware of the basic literature on the crusades, but recent, international scholarly trends hardly affected their views. In addition, Bárány's survey begins with the role of King Andrew II (1205–1235) during the Fifth Crusade and thus the events of the eleventh–twelfth centuries are almost completely omitted from the study.

It seems that relatively few pieces of information could be gained on the role played by Hungary in the Second Crusade, either by reading contemporary (or late medieval) sources or the relevant secondary literature. Hungarian scholar-

* The research was accomplished at the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Munich, Germany) and it was generously supported by the Roman Herzog Fellowship granted by the German Hertie (Frankfurt a. Main) and Humboldt Foundations (Bonn).

¹ A. Bárány, „Crusades and Crusading in Hungarian Historiography,” in *Europe and the World in European Historiography*, ed. Cs. Lévai, Pisa 2006, 129–18.

² P. G. Bozsóky, *Keresztes hadjáratok* [Crusades] Szeged 1995; P. G. Bozsóky, *A jeruzsálemi latin királyság* [The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem] Szeged 2004.

³ A. Borosy, „A keresztes háborúk és Magyarország I–II,” [The Crusades and Hungary], *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 109:1 (1996), 3–41; 109:2 (1996), 11–52.

ship has largely neglected the crusade as a specific area of study and, partly owing to this neglect, a number of unfounded judgments have been made. At the same time, scholarly works have been published which focused on the domestic and foreign policies of rulers of the Hungarian Kingdom in the twelfth century. These works have provided unknown insights into how the kingdom was governed or at least have highlighted new scholarly approaches and perspectives that historians might employ in the future.⁴

The American, James Ross Sweeney, originally published his views in English on Hungary and the crusades in 1981,⁵ and fortunately he also published his work in Hungarian.⁶ The title of the Hungarian publication is somewhat misleading, as it refers to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, although the article does not fully discuss the role played by Hungary during the First and the Second Crusades. The chronological span of the article reflected the fundamental elements of Sweeney's thesis. He divided the role played by the Kingdom of Hungary during the early crusades (that is, before c. 1291) into three periods. According to this thesis, Hungary played a rather passive role in the course of the first five decades of crusading. In the course of the crusading campaigns until the 1160s Hungary served as supplier territory for the passing armies. It underlines among other factors that Christianity has not yet rooted deep enough in the once pagan Hungarian society. Sweeney, however, focused on the following decades, that is the transition period of 1169–1195 when the idea of crusading, as well as the ideal of a crusader knight, spread and took root in Hungarian society. The peak of this social change was manifested in the crusader vow taken by King Béla III (1172–1196) of Hungary⁷ and, by its extension, to his son, Prince Andrew. King Andrew's (1205–1235) participation in the Fifth Crusade was apparently the most that Hungary had contributed so far to the crusade movement. As Sweeney dedicated only a couple of sentences to his "early period", his Hungarian readership could not gain much information about the first five decades of crusading.

Zoltan J. Kosztolnyik's monograph, published in 1987, proved to be a remarkable advance in the crusade's historiography, as he dedicated a whole chapter to the role played by Hungary in the Second Crusade.⁸ Although the work was published by an author of Hungarian origin, he did not comment upon or indeed fol-

⁴ For instance, the attempts to place the whole question into the context of international politics. See F. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni. Political relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the twelfth century*. Budapest 1989.

⁵ J. R. Sweeney, "Hungary in the Crusades, 1169–1218," *The International History Review* 3 (1981), 467–481.

⁶ Sweeney first delivered a lecture at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1982 and subsequently his "thesis" was published (in Hungarian) a little later: J. R. Sweeney, "Magyarország és a keresztes hadjáratok a XII–XIII. században," [Hungary and the Crusades in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries] *Századok* 118 (1984), 114–124.

⁷ The Hungarian ruler provided a contingent for the marching troops of the Third Crusade although it never reached the Holy Land but returned from Byzantine territories.

⁸ Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Béla III (1095–1196). Hungarian Domestic Policies and Their Impact upon Foreign Affairs*. New York 1987, 126–140.

low the defective Hungarian literature. Thus he failed to reflect on the Sweeney-thesis, although he might have known of it before he submitted his manuscript. Nevertheless, an important feature of Kosztolnyik's work is that it allowed an international readership to become acquainted with the relevant parts of the Hungarian chronicle⁹ augmented with an analysis. Kosztolnyik's work was crucial for the proper understanding of the train of events on the Second Crusade as well as for the motivation of the Hungarian chronicler. Although minor lapses¹⁰ can be found in Kosztolnyik's work, he formulated adequate and relevant questions which definitely furthered the research in this field. For instance, on what basis Conrad III demanded subsidy in Hungary: as a Christian knight while on pilgrimage or as the leader of the crusading army? Has Conrad come to agreement with Géza II and the German ruler exceeded the conditions settled in advance? Some of his questions have not yet been answered satisfactorily. Moreover, he shifted the context of the whole circle of questions towards internal politics and thus broadened the horizon of the those scholars analyzing the role of Hungary.

Several remaining scholarly deficiencies were rectified by the monograph of Ferenc Makk, published in English in 1989.¹¹ He improved our knowledge of the twelfth-century Hungarian foreign policy, and placed particular emphasis on Hungarian-Byzantine relations. Regrettably, Makk did not utilize the results of either Sweeney and Kosztolnyik's endeavors,¹² nor the work of Virginia G. Berry.¹³ At the same time, one must remark on the deficiencies in Berry's work too: the Canadian author relied heavily on outdated nineteenth-century secondary literature, although presumably there were more recent works at her disposal.

András Borosy intended to fill the still extant gaps in the historiography in 1996, and indeed the author dedicated a couple of pages to the crusader armies marching through Hungary during the Second Crusade.¹⁴ One of the most unfor-

⁹ "Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV," ed. A. Domanovszky, in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, ed. E. Szentpétery, 2 vols. Budapest, 1937-1938, (henceforth SRH) 1: 219-505.

¹⁰ Kosztolnyik, for instance, always refers to Conrad III as emperor (instead of "king" or "emperor-elect") which is rather problematic as it derives from the uncritical reading of the primary sources.

¹¹ Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 35-41.

¹² The latter presumably was due to the delay caused by the printing procedure: Makk used and referred the works of Kosztolnyik published in 1984.

¹³ V. G. Berry, "The Second Crusade," in *A History of the Crusades*, Vol. 1: *The First Hundred Years*, ed. M. W. Baldwin, gen. ed. Kenneth M. Setton, Madison-Milwaukee-London 1955, 1969², 463-512.

¹⁴ Borosy, "A keresztes háborúk és Magyarország," 25-27. A relevant article remained, however, undetected by him as it was published roughly at the same time: H. Zimmermann, "Die deutsch-ungarischen Beziehungen in der Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts und die Berufung der Siebenbürger Sachsen," in *Von Schwaben bis Jerusalem. Facetten staufischer Geschichte*. Sigmaringen 1995, 151-165. Reprinted in H. Zimmermann, *Siebenbürgen und seine Hospites Theutonici. Vorträge und Forschungen zur südostdeutschen Geschichte*. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag, Köln-Weimar-Wien 1996, 83-101.

fortunate features of Borosy's work is that it utilizes the necessary primary source, but in abridged versions which do not provide all the relevant information as their context are omitted.¹⁵ Borosy published his ideas in 2006, jointly with József Laszlovszky, in which he maintained his former arguments.¹⁶

The above-mentioned Sweeney thesis has not been criticized by any of the Hungarian scholars, although some of them have drawn a more detailed picture. Among the current crop of Hungarian scholars, László Veszprémy has enlarged Hungarian knowledge of the First Crusade by drawing on recent studies in international scholarship.¹⁷ Several reasons could be listed why Hungary played a rather passive role in the course of the early crusades. This passive attitude also concerns the additional waves of military campaigns between those bearing the traditional numbering: those took place in the first half of the twelfth century. Among the significant elements of the argumentation can be found the fact of "timing" as it was inappropriate for Hungary. It is quite likely that King Ladislas I (1077–1095) would have taken the cross as he made lot of efforts to strengthen the fundamentals of the Catholic faith and its institutions in Hungary. It partly was reflected in his canonization in 1192. The Hungarian chronicle tradition went even as far as "establishing" a (legend and anachronistic) story about the attempt of the Western leaders of the First Crusade to win King Ladislas as the overall leader of the undertaking.¹⁸ King Coloman's (1095–1116), Ladislas' successor's major concern was dissimilar after having ascended to the throne since he struggled for the consolidation of his power. Moreover, as crusading armies were not headed by crowned rulers at the end of the eleventh century, it is even more unlikely that the highest layer of Hungarian society, which was to some extent in-

Hungarian readership "discovered" it after its Hungarian translation in 2005 (in *Aetas* 20:4 (2005), 124–136).

¹⁵ A. F. Gombos, *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae*, 3 vols. Budapest 1937–1938.

¹⁶ A. Borosy-J. Laszlovszky, "Magyarország, a Szentföld és a korai keresztes hadjáratok," [Hungary, the Holy Land and the early Crusades] in *Magyarország és a keresztes háborúk. Lovagrendek és emlékeik*, ed. J. Laszlovszky, J. Majorossy, J. Zsengellér, Máriabesnyő-Gödöllő 2006, 84–85.

¹⁷ L. Veszprémy, "Magyarország és az első keresztes hadjárat. Aacheri Albert tanúsága," [Hungary and the First Crusade. The evidence of Albert of Aachen] *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 118 (2005), 501–516. He also compiled an updated chronology of the passage of the crusading troops marching through Hungary; *ibid.* pp. 513–514.

¹⁸ "Cumque celebrasset Pasca Domini in Bodrog, ecce nuncii de Francia et de Ispania, de Anglia et Britania ad eum venerunt, et precipue de Wyllermo fratre regis Francorum, et ei omnipotentis Dei iniuriam se ulcisci manifestaverunt et sanctam civitatem et sanctissimum sepulchrum de manu Sarracenorum liberare pensaverunt. Unde gloriosum regem rogaverunt, ut eis rector et gubernator in exercitu Iesu Christi existeret. Rex autem hoc audiens 'gavisus est gaudio magno', et in eadem festivitate a nobilibus Hungarie licentiatus est; tristabaturque tota Hungaria propter eum." "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 417–418. See also, L. Veszprémy, "Dux et preceptor Hierosolomitano. König Ladislaus (László) von Ungarn als imaginärer Kreuzritter," in ... *The Man of Many Devices, Who Wandered Full Many Ways: Festschrift in Honor of János M. Bak*, ed. M. Sebők, B. Nagy, Budapest 1999, 470–471.

volved in pagan uprisings a couple of decades earlier,¹⁹ had seriously considered seeking martyrdom as soldiers of Christ. There is no palpable signs of either religious fanaticism or the going on pilgrimage on a regular basis although the locals witnessed their Western European fellow Christian travelling towards the Holy Land on "Christ's business" from the first decades of the eleventh century.

Towards the Second Crusade

Christianity had taken root in Hungary by the middle of the twelfth century. Indeed, neither the Christian doctrine, nor the Catholic institution was seriously threatened throughout the twelfth century, and the church benefited greatly from royal donations during this period. Given King Géza II's (1141–1162) policy towards the Church²⁰ it is quite plausible that he would have taken the cross if his foreign relations and domestic affairs had allowed him to do so. According to the extant sources, the political situation did not favor the participation of the Hungarian ruler in the Second Crusade. Time-consuming arrangements ensured that preparations for the campaign were conducted efficiently, although it seems, *argumentum ex silentio*, that the crusading bull, *Quantum praedecessores*, did not reach the Kingdom of Hungary.²¹ There is no sign in the narrative sources that Bernard of Clairvaux had sent letters to Hungary as he did towards those territories that he could not visit personally such as England.²² Nor it can be proven that, similar to other European countries, the Cistercians promulgated the notion of the crusade in Hungary, although it is possible that they did do since the Cistercian Order had settled in Hungary by the early 1140s. It is worth emphasizing, however, that despite their previous settlement, the Order's activities can only be observed from the 1170s.²³

If recruiting for the Second Crusade was indeed well organised, why was Hungary omitted from the recruiting drive? Suggesting that Christianity had not sufficiently taken root or that the institution of the church was not developed satisfactorily is clearly not adequate. The call to arms reached the rulers of the Bohemians and the Poles,²⁴ who converted to Christianity around the same time as

¹⁹ P. Engel, *The Realm of Saint Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526*, London–New York 2001, 31.

²⁰ For instance, during his reign the Cistercians settled in Hungary (c.1142); he also promoted the foundation of the Hospitaller Order of Canons Regular of St. Stephen (c.1150).

²¹ G. Constable, "The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries," in *idem, Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth century*, Aldershot 2008, 276–277. It seems from the ongoing *Hungaria Pontificia* project that no trace of Eugenius III's call can be found in extant papal–Hungarian correspondence.

²² Ch. Tyerman, *God's War. A new history of the Crusades*. London 2006, 280–281.

²³ L. Koszta, "Ciszterci Rend elterjedése Magyarországon a kolostoralapítások idején, 1142–1270," [The Spread of the Cistercian Order in Hungary during the foundation of their monasteries] *Magyar Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok* 5:1–2 (1993), 116.

²⁴ Ch. Lübke, *Das östliche Europa. Die Deutschen und das europäische Mittelalter 2*, Munich 2004, 517.

the Hungarians. Indeed, the call not only reached Wladislav II (1140–1172) and Boleslaw IV the Curly (1146–1173), but they themselves took the cross. A reasonable part of the Gregorian reforms and the indirect goals of Pope Eugenius III were directed towards the extension of the notion of *Ecclesia* into *Christianitas*, that is to give an active role to Christendom in its broader sense²⁵ it would have been a good opportunity to give the Hungarians a “chance” to prove that they belong to the same community. If, however, we approach from the relation of Conrad III with the Bohemian and the Polish rulers then the conclusion becomes somewhat dissimilar.

It seems that the major organizers of the crusade renounced such “interests” of *Christianitas* already during the preparations may point to the very political situation even though does not reply to all questions raised. The peculiarity of the Hungarian situation is partly rooted in that the kingdom was successively in conflict with the western Roman Empire, Byzantium or the papacy since the 1070s. After many decades of conflict, the rule of King Béla II (1131–1141) witnessed a relatively short period of peace which lasted until the mid-1140s. In 1146, not only did the peace came to an end, but the year also witnessed the beginning of the most intensive interval of Hungarian foreign policy since the settlement of the Magyars in the Carpathian basin at the end of the ninth century. It was her foreign policy which seems to have influenced Hungary’s participation in the Second Crusade.

Receiving the crusading armies: tensions all around

The strained relations between Hungary and the western Roman Empire derived from the expansionist politics of the emperor-elect, King Conrad III of Germany, which are evident in a letter sent by the king to the Byzantine Emperor, John II Comnenus, in 1142.²⁶ The German king stated that the neighboring territories of Germany belong within the sphere of interest of the western Roman Empire, and thus the rulers of these countries owed obedience to him. Although Géza II was not a vassal of Conrad III, a pretender to the Hungarian throne, a certain Boris,²⁷ provided the German ruler with potential political leverage. The first signs of the deterioration in the relations between Hungary and the Empire appeared around 1145 following the cancellation of the betrothal, agreed in 1139, between Sophia,

²⁵ Y. Katzir, “The Second Crusade and the Redefinition of *Ecclesia*: *Christianitas* and Papal Coercive Power,” in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. M. Gervers, New York 1992, 4.

²⁶ “Gesta Friderici Imperatoris auctoribus Ottone episcopo et Ragewino praeposito Frisingensibus,” ed. R. Wilmans, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 20, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannover 1868, 363–364; F. Makk, *Ungarische Außenpolitik (896–1196)*, Herne 1999, 117.

²⁷ Boris (*Kalamanos*) was born of the second wife of King Coloman, the Russian Euphemia. However, the Russian king never acknowledged him as his legitimate son. The wife of Boris, Princess Anne (Arété) Dukaina was a relative of Joannes II Comnenus (1118–1143), thus Boris occasionally bore the titles of *krales* and *panhypersebastos*.

sister of Géza II and Henry (IV) († 1150), son of Conrad III.²⁸ However, Hungary did not react to this re-buff at this point. At the same time, the marriage between the Byzantine Emperor, Manuel Comnenus, (1143–1180), and the German Princess, Bertha of Sulzbach, in 1146,²⁹ caused losing political ground for the Hungarian foreign relations even though the forming alliance was primarily launched against the Southern Italian Normans. One of the most important features of Hungarian foreign policy was to attribute particular importance to its geopolitical situation in which the kingdom might easily find itself surrounded by enemies, and this situation could have manifested itself in a Byzantine–German alliance.³⁰ These fears appear to have been realized when Boris attacked Hungarian territory in the Spring of 1146 with the help of Austrian–Bavarian mercenary troops. This military undertaking achieved some success on the western edge of the Hungarian realm,³¹ but the city of Pozsony (modern Bratislava, Slovakia), which the allies occupied, had recently been regained by the Hungarian ruler.³² Since Géza II was well aware that it was probably Conrad III who stood behind the attack, the Hungarian king avoided a prompt counter-strike. Instead, he first started promoting by subsidies the Duke Welf VI, Margrave of Tuscany († 1191)³³ in the hope that the duke would engage Conrad III far from the frontiers of Hungary. Since Welf VI also received political and financial support from King Roger II of Sicily (1130–1154)³⁴, parallel to the Hungarian–German opposition, the Hungarian–Byzantine conflict apparently sharpened. Moreover, as Pope Eugenius III was in disagreement with Roger II,³⁵ the papal–Hungarian relations were also soured. Nonetheless, in autumn 1146, Géza II turned his attentions westwards in a bid to strike back for Boris' invasion earlier in the year. Géza attacked the Margrave Henry II (Jasomirgott) of Babenberg (1141–1156), and the Hungarian king

²⁸ A détente can be observed in the Welf–Stauf relationship from 1142 and afterwards, according to Ferenc Makk, Conrad III pushed no more a German–Hungarian dynastic relation such a way. Cf. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 37.

²⁹ Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 38.

³⁰ Cf. P. Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, Cambridge 2000, 211–217.

³¹ *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising, and his continuator, Rahewin*, tr. Ch. Mierow, New York 1953, 64–65.

³² "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 453. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 36.

³³ "Historia Welforum Weingartensis," ed. L. Weiland, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 21, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannover 1869, 468; Burchardus Urspergensis, "Chronicon," eds. O. Abel, L. Weiland, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 23, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannover 1874, 344.

³⁴ For the political alliance of Roger II, Welf VI and Géza II, see, *inter alia*, F. Hausmann, "Die Anfänge des staufischen Zeitalters unter Konrad III." in T. Mayer, ed. *Probleme des 12. Jahrhunderts. Reichenau-Vorträge 1965–1967, Vorträge und Forschungen 12*, Konstanz–Stuttgart 1968, 59. A. Haverkamp, *Medieval Germany, 1056–1273*. Oxford–New York 1988, 143. Zimmermann, "Die deutsch-ungarischen Beziehungen," 96; H. Houben, *Roger II of Sicily: A Ruler between East and West*. Cambridge 2002, 90.

³⁵ J. Richard, *The Crusades, c.1071–c.1291*. Cambridge 1999, 160.

dealt the German troops a heavy blow near the River Leitha.³⁶ Although Géza II regarded his own military action as a counter-strike, it was in fact a *casus belli* for Conrad III, and Conrad might have attacked Géza had he not taken the cross.³⁷ On the other hand, it is not surprising that Eugenius III did not want to recruit the Hungarian monarchy since doing so might have risked the whole expedition. It was, no doubt, "in the air" that if the troops do not take the offer of Roger II, by choosing the sea-road,³⁸ the majority of the crusading armies took the inland route which leads through the Hungarian Kingdom. Supposedly, the memory of the ill fated march of the irregular troops³⁹ of the First Crusade was still vivid for those who planned and prepared the campaign.

As part of their preparations, Eugenius III and King Louis VII of France contacted Manuel Comnenus and the rulers of Hungary and Sicily in order to ask for logistical support. A German assembly, convoked in the Spring of 1147, was informed of Louis' preparations, and it decided that those crusaders under the nominal leadership of Conrad III would follow the classic pilgrim route to Constantinople, and hence to Asia Minor and the Holy Land. Thus it was determined that the crusaders would pass through Hungary.⁴⁰ The prevailing tension between Conrad III and Géza II, however, caused a serious diplomatic burden. The Hungarian ruler was well prepared. He even appears to have used "intelligence": it had come to Géza's attention that the pretender, Boris, intended to travel to Hungary with the army of Conrad III.⁴¹ According to Western historiography, Géza II was afraid of a counter-strike from Conrad III,⁴² although this is rather implausible given that under the aegis of the crusading vow it was unlikely that crusaders would attack fellow Catholics. Admittedly, the chain of events concerning the crusader attack on the Catholic city of Zara during the Fourth Crusade makes us very cautious in this respect, but such an attack was unlikely in the middle of the twelfth century. In addition, the Hungarian chroniclers offer a different scenario.⁴³ They reveal that a group of Hungarian nobles attempted to support Boris in his plans for the Hungarian throne. Accordingly, Conrad III was not Géza II's major concern,⁴⁴ it was the possibility of a conspiracy or an open rebellion in his realm occasioned by the appearance of Boris. It is unclear how widespread support was for Boris, but we can suggest that he had as much support outside of Hungary as he did within the kingdom. It seems that he managed

³⁶ *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 67–68.

³⁷ J. Phillips, "Papacy, Empire and the Second Crusade," in *The Second Crusade: Scope and consequences*, ed. J. Phillips, M. Hoch, Manchester-New York 2001, 21.

³⁸ Houben, *Roger II of Sicily*, 88.

³⁹ More recently scholars seem to reappraise these contingents and do not regard them so scrappy any more. Cf. Veszprémy, "Magyarország és az első keresztes hadjárat," 504–509.

⁴⁰ J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: a short history*, 2nd ed. London 2005, 125–126.

⁴¹ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 457–458. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 40.

⁴² Berry, "The Second Crusade," 483.

⁴³ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 453–457.

⁴⁴ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 459. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 39.

to convince Conrad III to remove Boris from his army and thus not to increase the tension between the two kings.⁴⁵ It is somewhat odd that most scholars have neglected this aspect of Géza's concerns,⁴⁶ however, it may provide an explanation to several points raised by Kosztolnyik. For instance, the notion that the wealth of the Hungarian Church secured Conrad's passage through the realm.⁴⁷ According to the Hungarian chronicler, the German ruler who reached the country in the middle of June arrived "not as pilgrim of Christ but as thief and behaved as tyrant". Undoubtedly, the Hungarian Chronicle⁴⁸ depicts the German king unfavorably and also exaggerates the damages caused by the crusading army.⁴⁹ The question still remains, however, on what grounds did Conrad demand money in Hungary. Presumably, it was the charge incurred for keeping Boris away from Hungary; a payment based on an agreement between Conrad III and Géza II, but an arrangement that the Hungarian chronicler either did not know about or chose to omit from his text. Nevertheless, no recordable incident took place in the course of the march of the German troops. What is more, according to Kosztolnyik, relying upon Otto of Freising, Hungarians joined the crusading army in large numbers.⁵⁰ It is very unlikely that significant numbers of Hungarians joined the marching troops either spontaneously or in an organized way with no mention in the Hungarian chronicle composition. It neither seems probable that the German army, depicted very negatively by the Hungarian chronicler, attracted many locals. The exact numbers of troops, however, is not known. The 900,000 soldiers mentioned in a Byzantine source⁵¹ is an exaggeration while the number of 70,000, occurring in Western sources, sounds more realistic.⁵² Nonetheless, the German army left the Kingdom of Hungary on 20 July at Barancs (modern Braničevo, Serbia).

Odo of Deuil and the Hungarian Chronicle reveal that the French army, led by King Louis VII, followed the same route through Europe as that taken by the Germans. The French contingents advanced quicker than the Germans as they made use of the bridges which the latter had constructed to facilitate their ad-

⁴⁵ Odo de Deogilo, "De protectione Ludovici VII. regis Francorum in Orientem," ed. G. Waitz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 26, ed. G. Waitz, Hannover 1882, 62.

⁴⁶ Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 39, 139:n97.

⁴⁷ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 458; Berry, "The Second Crusade," 483.

⁴⁸ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 458.

⁴⁹ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 458.

⁵⁰ "Gesta Friderici Imperatoris," 375. Berry, "The Second Crusade," 484. Berry mentions that Conrad was joined by a number of Hungarians. She presumably found evidence of this in the *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*.

⁵¹ Cf. Richard, *The Crusades*, 161.

⁵² Magnus presbyter Reichespergensis, "Annales Reichespergenses," ed. W. Wattenbach, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 17, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannover 1861, 462; "Historia imperatorum auctore anonymo," in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, ed. J. Burckhard Mencken, Lipsiae 1728, 3: 107; Rogerius de Wendover, "Chronica," ed. F. Liebermann, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 28, ed. R. Pauli, Hannover 1888, 29-30.

vance.⁵³ The rapid march through Hungary⁵⁴ was also aided by the fact that Géza II received the French ruler and his entourage in a much friendlier fashion than he did Conrad III.⁵⁵ It is worth noting the opinion of Z. Kosztolnyik who notes that the Hungarian chronicler depicted the French ruler in much more positive way than he did Conrad.⁵⁶ Reading between the lines, however, one may find another explanation for the "friendly" tone of the chronicler's description. There is no doubt that Géza II gave numerous gifts to Louis VII; they also launched plans for cooperation in the future.⁵⁷ Moreover, the Hungarian king asked the French ruler to be the godfather of his offspring, the later Stephen III.⁵⁸ At the same time, we should note that Boris eventually arrived in Hungary with the French troops. This soon led to tension between the parties, especially when Louis VII refused Géza II's demand for Boris' extradition from the French camp by claiming that Boris was allowed asylum, even though Louis was very much aware that Boris' primary goal when entering Hungary was to raise his claim the Hungarian throne.⁵⁹ The canonical considerations of this inconvenient situation were studied by Kosztolnyik.⁶⁰ Makk emphasized that the behavior of Louis was driven by political prudence. Louis regarded Boris as a relative of Manuel Comnenus who had expressed serious reservations concerning the Second Crusade.⁶¹ Accordingly, Makk believes that Louis protected the pretender in a bid to avoid conflict with the Byzantines. According to the Hungarian chronicler, Boris realized that his status among the French was unsustainable and, being afraid of extradition, he finally managed to escape from the French camp.⁶² However, Odo of Deuil, who was an eyewitness of the events, informs us that Boris remained in the company of the French and freely left Hungary under the protection of Louis VII.⁶³ After the negotiations between Géza and Louis had finished, the French army departed from Hungary although Géza II kept an eye on the marching army until it had definitely left for the Bulgarian territories.⁶⁴ Just a year later, the German and the Byzantine rulers reconfirmed their coalition against the Normans.⁶⁵ This alliance, however, hardly affected the fact that Géza II found his kingdom in almost complete political isolation. The escalation of the conflicts was

⁵³ Odo de Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII*, 33.

⁵⁴ It lasted 15 days and thus it was indeed a remarkable rate of march. Odo de Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII*, 31.

⁵⁵ Berry, "The Second Crusade," 488–489. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 40; Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, 127.

⁵⁶ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 459. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned*, 131–133.

⁵⁷ Odo de Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII*, 35.

⁵⁸ "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 458.

⁵⁹ Odo de Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII*, 37. "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 459–460.

⁶⁰ Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned*, 133.

⁶¹ Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 40.

⁶² Cf. "Chronici Hungarici," SRH 1: 459–460.

⁶³ Odo de Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII*, 37–39.

⁶⁴ Cf. Odo de Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII*, 39.

⁶⁵ H. Vollrath, "Konrad III und Byzanz," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 59 (1977), 324.

perhaps obviated by the launching of the Second Crusade but quite soon Byzantine forces attacked Hungary in 1151.⁶⁶

Conclusion

A slight modification of the above outlined Sweeney-thesis is suggested. The reason for the absence of the active participation of the Hungarians during the Second Crusade was not owing to a widespread lack of Christianity or the weakness of the Catholic Church, it was due to the contemporary political milieu. Neither the organizers of the crusade nor the Hungarian king dared to risk involving the Hungarians more than they actually did. If we allow an ahistorical "play with thoughts" and imagine what might have happened if Conrad III had defeated Géza II before 1146, then the latter might have taken the cross and, as a vassal of the German king, gone to the Holy Land in the company of the Bohemian and Polish rulers.

⁶⁶ W. Treadgold, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, Stanford 1997, 642.

Fertő River

A Low Water Level Signal or Something Else?*

ANDREA KISS



'Fluvius' – definit or general hydrological term?

'Fluvius' – similarly to 'stagnum' and 'lacus' – was used in the Middle Ages as an attribute together with the proper name of Fertő (Lake Fertő/Neusiedlersee, today located at the borderline of Austria and Hungary). The name of Fertő was used not only for the above-mentioned lakes but also for several other water bodies. Thus, the expression 'fluvius Fertő', without its context, can refer to other waters in the country.¹ In our case, nevertheless, it seemed or believed that the term 'fluvius' was used in connection with the lake itself. As we will see later, the references to the word 'fluvius' were applied by researchers as an indicator of contemporary environmental conditions of the lake. Thus, they made direct connection between the application of the word and the actual water level.

The 'fluvius' problem and its possible connection to the actual water level had a quite large impact on the theories of scholars studying Lake Fertő: the problem has already appeared in the eighteenth century.² The idea that the lake sometimes became a river induced real debates and long disputes again from the 1860s.³ Probably the most detailed and influential opinion about the problem was given by Imre Nagy who argued that in the Arpadian Period and at the beginning of the fourteenth century the lake was much narrower and smaller than today. The clearest "proof" of this "fact" was the frequent use of 'stagnum Ferteu' and 'fluvius

* Being part of a more extensive analysis of medieval Hungarian written evidence on weather and climate, the present paper was supported by the EU FP6 project entitled *Millennium*.

¹ For more details, see, for example, I. Szamota and Gy. Zolnai, *Magyar oklevélszótár*. [Hungarian charter-dictionary], Budapest 1902–1906. 'Fertő' appears there as *stagnum*, *prata*, *aqua*, *terre paludose*, *locus aquosus*, *locus lutosus* (p. 242–243).

² See, for example, J. Kis, *A Fertő tavának geographiai, historiai és természeti leírása 1797-ben*. [Description of the geographical, historical and natural conditions of Lake Fertő in 1797] Pest 1816.

³ See, for example, I. Nagy, "Sopron múltja," [Past of Sopron], *Századok* 8 (1883), 12–52. G. Thüring, "A Fertő és vidéke," [The Fertő and its surroundings] *Földrajzi Közlemények* 14 (1886), 469–508.

Ferteu'.⁴ By the first half of the twentieth century this latter opinion became widely accepted and dominant in the scholarly literature.⁵

Probably the most realistic theory, however, was published by a hydrologist, Zoltán Károlyi, in 1966.⁶ Instead of searching for the theoretical connections between the water level and the '*fluvius*' charters, on the basis of the hydrological conditions of the lake basin he pointed to the only hydrologically possible place as the most presumable location of the '*fluvius*': to the ford at Pomogy (Pamhagen, today in Austria henceforth and Sarród, between the basin of Lake Fertő and the Hanság (Wasen - A) wetlands.⁷ Although from a scholarly point of view this latter opinion, which takes hydrological and geomorphologic conditions into account, sounds more realistic, the late nineteenth-century "low water level theory" was and still is more widely known and quoted among scholars.⁸ It is also interesting to mention that probably the most respected Austrian Fertő-specialist, Fritz Kopf did not touch the '*fluvius*'-problem at all, although he studied the past water level changes of the lake.⁹

Fertő as a waterflow: the contemporary charter evidence

The term '*fluvius* Fertő' appeared in much more cases than that of the Balaton. However, since this term was also applied as an indicator of the contemporary water level and general environmental conditions of Lake Fertő, it is worth surveying the 'river'-problem in a detailed way (see Table 1):

⁴ Nagy, "Sopron múltja," 38.

⁵ See, for example, J. Bárdosi, "A magyar Fertő halászata," [The fishery of the Hungarian Fertő] Sopron 1993, 22; L. Varga, "Katasztrófák a Fertő tó életében" [Catastrophes in the life of Lake Fertő], *Állattani Közlemények* 28 (1931), 133-134; D. Élő, *Sarród monográfiája* [Monography of Sarród] Budapest 1938, 19-20.

⁶ Z. Károlyi, "A Fertő és Hanság vízügyi kérdéseinek mai állása," [Present stage of the hydrological questions of the Fertő-Hanság] in K. Stelczer, ed. *Beszámoló a Vízgazdálkodási Tudományos Kutató Intézet 1964. évi munkájából*, Budapest 1966, 170-187.

⁷ Károlyi, "A Fertő és Hanság," 179-180.

⁸ "We can find descriptions and reports already at some eleventh-century historians (sic!) who once called the Fertő as 'the Swamp of Moson' (sic!) and in other case as '*Fluvius Ferten*.' (sic!) This latter name was probably born in case of a very low water-level at the ford of Rust and Illmic", quotation from Z. Kováts and E. Kozmáné Tóth, eds. *A Fertő-tó természeti adottságai / Naturverhältnisse des Neusiedlersees*, Budapest 1985, 16.

⁹ F. Kopf, "Wasserwirtschaftliche Probleme des Neusiedlersees und des Seewinkels," *Österreichische Wasserwirtschaft* 15 (1963), 192.

No.	Date of issue	Issued by	Donated to	Content	Referred place-name	Critical issue
1	May, 1318 (transcription: No. 4, 11 and 12)	king (Charles I)	Nicolaus and Mike, noblemen of Keych ¹⁰ (neighbouring village)	prohibition (against the neighbouring nobleman)	Vitézfölde (Apetlon-A)	UB 3: 109; ¹¹ Nagy (based on No. 12; see also No. 11) 1: 81–82
2	16 September, 1318	king (Charles I)	Grange of Mönchhof	privilege, donation	Neunaigen (Mönchhof-A)	UB 3: 114
3	28 September, 1318	chapter of Győr	Heiligenkreuz (Mönchhof)	transcription, authorisation	See No. 2	UB 3: 117
4	January, 1324 (No. 1 transcribed)	king (Charles I)	Thomas, nobleman of Keych	corroboration	Vitézfölde	UB 3: 167
5	May, 1324 (with reference to an earlier royal charter)	chapter of Győr	Mönchhof	reambulation	Potfalu (Potersdorf-A)	UB 3: 175
6	June, 1330 (transcriptions: No. 7, 8)	king (Charles I)	royal town of Sopron	privilege, donation	Sopron	UB 4: 261
7	March, 1338 (No. 6 transcribed)	king (Charles I)	royal town of Sopron	privilege, donation	Sopron	UB 4: 245; Nagy 1: 141
8	April, 1339 (No. 6 transcribed)	king (Charles I)	royal town of Sopron	privilege, donation	Sopron	UB 4: 261; Házi 1: 73

¹⁰ The village later deserted, today Götsch (a lake kept the name of the village), in Austria (Prov. Burgenland). For more details, see *Allgemeine Landestopographie des Burgenlandes*, Eisenstadt 1954, Vol. 1: 197.

¹¹ I. Lindeck-Pozza, et al., *Urkundenbuch des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete der Komitate Wieselburg, Ödenburg und Eisenburg*, 5 vols., Vienna 1955–2003, (henceforth: UB).

9	July, 1346	chapter of Esztergom	Paulus de Nagymarton and his relatives	landed property division	Pomogy (Pamhagen-A)	UB 5: 140; Nagy 1: 187
10	May, 1360	king's secret chancellor	Johannes and Nikolaus, sons of Kemen de Jak	landed property exchange ¹²	Urkony ¹³	Nagy 1: 325
11	June, 1410 (No. 4 transcribed)	Palatine (Nicolaus de Gara)	king (Sigismund)	dispute over property rights	Vitézfölde	DI.87832 ¹⁴
12	Aug, 1410 (No. 4 transcribed)	chapter of Buda ¹⁵	Master Jakab	transcription, authorisation	Vitézfölde	DI.1917 ¹⁶

¹² It was mentioned together with such other settlements as Gyóró, Ligvánd, Lózs and Urkony – all were located in Sopron County.

¹³ Deserted medieval village partly at the southern edge and partly in the ford between the Hanság and Lake Fertő. To its exact location, see: A. Kiss and I. Paszternák, "Hol volt Urkony? Történeti földrajzi és régészeti adalékok egy középkori falu topográfiájához," [Where was Urkony located? Historical geographical and archeological data on the topography of a deserted medieval village] *Soproni Szemle* 52:4 (2000), 402–419.

¹⁴ E. Mályusz, I. Borsa, *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár* [Chartulary of the Sigismund period] Vols. 1–9, Budapest 1951–2004, 2: 378. – with reference to DI.83060. This latter charter, however, refers to a certain Moch possession in Hontvár County, and as such, has nothing to do with our present discussion. In my opinion, our reference charter must be DI.87832 instead of DI.83060. In the original charter of DI.87832, issued in June 1410, the following text is included: "*in eadem Wytezfelde quinquaginta Jugera in se continente et exceptis tribus locis piscature in fluvii seu lacu feyertho in ipsa possessione Wytezfelde aparte orientali existentibus.*" In spite of this UB 3: 109–110. suggests the reading "Flyertho."

¹⁵ According to UB 3: 109, it was issued by the chapter of Vasvár. On the other hand, the chapter of Buda is mentioned in the original text (DI.1917), to which I. Nagy, *Vármegye története. Oklevéltár*. [A history of Sopron County. Chartulary] 2 vols. Sopron 1889, 1: 82. also refers.

¹⁶ UB 3: 109. referring to the original charter: DI.1917. Here, my reading is the following: "... *poss Wytezfelde vocate in Comitatu Soproniensis inter possessionem keych et Tard iuxta fluuium ferthev Iuxta fluuium ferthev ... terra seu possessio vytezfelde vocata in Comitatu Soproniensis inter possessionem keych et Tard iuxta fluuium ferthev existens ... exceptis tribus locis pyiscature in fluuiio seu loco fertew in ... possessione vytezfelde aparte orientali existentibus....*"

13	July, 1416	chapter of Posega	Ilko, daughter of Johannes de Chorna	donation	Chyl (Rust-A)	R-Z 1: 150 ¹⁷
14	Oct, 1418 (only in transcription - see No. 15)	<i>vicecomites</i> and noble judges of Rábaköz region	Franciscus de Asszonyfalva and Gregorius de Osth	inquiry ordered	Széplak	Dl.86274; Mályusz-Borsa 6: 590
15	Nov, 1418 (No. 14 transcribed)	<i>vicecomites</i> and noble judges of Rábaköz region	Franciscus de Asszonyfalva and Gregorius de Osth	inquiry held: proved complain	Széplak	Dl.86274; Mályusz and Borsa 6: 616
16	March, 1435	king (Sigismund)	Paulus and Vilhelmus de Frakno	corroboration	Pomogy	Nagy 2: 230
17	1520	(stewart)	(Kanizsai-family)	inventory: incomes	Domain of Sárvár and Kapuvár	Dl.37179: 3, 4
18	1521	(stewart)	(Kanizsai-family)	inventory: incomes	Domain of Sárvár and Kapuvár	Dl.37179: 50, 51
19	1522	(stewart)	(Kanizsai-family)	inventory: incomes	Domain of Sárvár and Kapuvár	Dl.26231: 13, 30

¹⁷ B. Radványzsky and L. Závodszy, *A Héderváry-család oklevéltára*. [Chartulary of the Héderváry family] Budapest 1909, Vol. 1. See also, Mályusz-Borsa, *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, 5: 563.

Out of the presently known '*fluvius Fertő*' occurrences sixteen are to be found in charters while three others appear in late medieval inventories. Ten (No. 1–10) were issued in the fourteenth, six in the fifteenth (No. 11–16) and three in the early sixteenth centuries (No. 17). However, out of the ten fourteenth-century charters, two are simple transcriptions (No. 3 and 8) while in case of the other two – beyond the simple transcription – Fertő river is also mentioned in the main text (No. 4 and 7). Out of the six fifteenth-century charters, three are transcriptions (No. 11, 12 and 15, but the last one is a transcript of a fifteenth-century charter) and three are originals where '*fluvius*' name was directly used (No. 13, 14, 16). Additionally, the three sixteenth-century inventories are also contemporary. These proportions are important, because there is a clear evidence that both in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Fertő river appeared as an original, contemporary ("alive") term and not merely as a simple transcription. Thus, on the basis of dates, '*fluvius Fertő*' was an actively used term in the fourteenth, fifteenth as well as in the early sixteenth centuries.

Spatial distribution of local names

Studying the geographical distribution of the villages to which charters primarily refer, the proportions become even more interesting. Seven charters still refer directly to the area around and in the ford between Lake Fertő and the Hanság wetlands (No. 1, 4, 9–12, 16), but No. 11 and 12 are simple transcriptions. Additionally, we also have to count here with No. 14 and 15 (though 15 is mere a transcription of 14), since the village of Széplak is located not far from the ford, either (the neighboring village, Sarród, is already located at the ford). However, it is much more difficult to find any connection between the rest of the referred settlements, apart from the fact that all landowners (or those who ordered the charter) lived in the Fertő-area or possessed lands which were directly located at the shoreline of Lake Fertő.

Out of these extant eight occurrences, three early fourteenth-century charters refer to Sopron (No. 6–8); actually, to a certain *tributum* of the Fertő river, possessed by Sopron.¹⁸ Another three is connected to the Cistercian grange of

¹⁸ The '*tributum Fertő*'-problem is especially complicated because it seems that there was not only one such "tax", but different '*tributum Fertő*' was levied, for example, in the village of Meggyes (e.g., in 1311, cf. Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 73; 1352: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 237, etc.), at the western shoreline, close to Sopron, some other *tributum* was mentioned in Széplak (1335: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 132: "*tributum ... in pratis Ferteu*"), and at Sarród (1420: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 2: 48: "*cum tributo aque seu lacu Fertew vocati*" – at the ford) all connected to the lake. See also: J. Belitzky, *Sopron vármegye története*. [History of Sopron county] Budapest 1938, 1: 640–641.

To the lake *tributum*, mentioned in general, see for example: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 241 (1353): "*medieta tributi Fertew*" J. Házi, ed. *Sopron szabad királyi város története*. Oklevelek. [A history of the royal exempt town of Sopron. Diplomatarium] 2 ser. Sopron 1921–1943, Ser. 1, Vol. 3: 342 (1451): "*tributum nostrum de lacu Ferthe*," Házi, Sopron, 1/4: 242 (1457): "*ut sibi ex parte tributi Fferthew fecistis*," Házi, Sopron, 1/5: 108 (1277/1317/1464): "*Ad hec volumus* (Ladislaus IV), *quod medietatem tributi Ferthew, quam*

Mönchhof/Barátudvar (Mönchhof-A) and its possession (No. 2, 3, 5), Pátfalú (Podersdorf-A), located at the eastern shoreline of the lake – dated approximately to the same period. In the sixteenth-century inventories of Kapuvár domain (No. 17–19) the incomes of the river were mentioned either without any localization (though clearly belonging to the lake) or together with the name of a fisher from Hegykő, a settlement located at the southern shoreline of Lake Fertő. However, we have no information whether the mentioned person paid for the fishing rights of a particular area of the ford (which was and still is one of the richest areas in fish at Fertő),¹⁹ or he paid for fishing in other places or in the whole lake.

Last but not least, the biggest “mystery” comes with the early fifteenth-century appearance of Rust ‘*iuxta fluvium fertu*’, since this settlement is located at the western shoreline of the lake (No. 13). Out of the nineteen data, this is the only charter evidence which connects the Fertő river with the Illmic-Rust area where several late nineteenth-century researchers located the ‘*fluvius*’. Mönchhof, Podersdorf and Rust were all located at the shoreline of the lake or their possessions extended to the shoreline. Thus, in the last cases the name ‘*fluvius*’ in itself could only refer to the whole lake; on the basis of the available information, however, no specific area can be determined.

As we can see, merely on the basis of the location of the toponyms no clear conclusion can be drawn. Nevertheless, it seems that around half of the charters refer to the close surroundings of the ford between the lake and the wetland area.

People, authorities and the main reasons of issuing charter evidence

It is also important to know to what extent were the people who demanded or issued the charters could be aware of the local environmental conditions. In case of the noblemen of Keych (No. 1 and 4) it is quite clear that they – living at the actual spot (in the neighboring village) – had clear information about the exact conditions, especially because they even specified the three fishing places in the ‘river’ itself. It is also quite obvious that the authors of the early sixteenth-century inventories had to be well-aware of the place they were writing about. However, what can we do with the other cases? The picture is quite clear: with the

Bela, avus noster, et Stephanus, pater noster, ..., pro reparacione et conservacione turrium... concesserant;” Hází, Sopron, 1/6: 148 (1496): “*semper et antiquo lacu sive stagnum Fewrthew nuncupatum, cum media pars illius lacus sive tributum eiusdem, ... libere et secure piscari habuerint,...*” Hází, Sopron, 1/7: 387 (1530): “*ob solucionem annuam tributi Fertew, vulgo reciale nuncupatum.*”

In German documents, presumably the same ‘*tributum Fertő*’ appears under the name of ‘*seemaut*’. See, for example: Hází, Sopron, 1/3: 33; the *urbarium* of Kismarton/Eisenstadt (1515: DL258610) – for more ‘*Seemaut*’ reference, see Note 6.

¹⁹ See for example: 1356: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 257, 1558: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 2: 640: “*... necnon vadi in fine eiusdem possessionis Sarrod super stagnum Ferthew versus possessionem Pamagh tendentis, piscaturarumque eiusdem stagni Ferthew ad eandem porcionem pertinencium....*”

Note the ‘*vadum*’ which indirectly refers to a road crossing the wetlands from the north to the south.

exception of King Sigismund of Hungary (1387–1437), all the others who ordered or asked for the charters to be issued were not only landowners in the close vicinity of the lake, either in Sopron or in Moson counties, but in most cases the centre of their possessions were located in these two counties, not far from the lake. So, those who asked for the charters presumably came from the area and they therefore had to know it well enough not to make a big mistake with basic topographic names.

It is a rather interesting point that almost one third of all the charters (seven) were issued by the king and two others by his close “colleagues,” namely the palatine and the secret chancellor. The fact that those who asked for these charters went that far and found it important to have the highest legislation in their problem shows the general significance of their problems – or that of the reference area.

In the two cases of four charters (No. 3, 5, 14, 15) local authorities (chapter of Győr, *vicecomites* and local noble judges) issued the documents to record local affairs. In both cases a local survey was needed. Thus, while in half of the cases the highest authorities issued the charters which fact shows a special importance of either the actual legal problems, persons (who asked for the charter) or the geographical location, there are examples for local debates where local legal bodies issued the documents referring to Fertő river, after making a local survey to give a correct proof about the exact circumstances of the actual legal case.

Probably the most important key to answer the Fertő-river question is, however, why all these charters were written and how much their descriptions are connected to specific lands, waters as well as other features of the area. The answer is not obvious, since there is only one charter, with perambulation of boundaries, in which the ‘river’ can only mean the (eastern shoreline of the) lake at Podersdorf (No. 5). In most other cases the river-name is applied to locate certain settlements (“*iuxta/prope fluvium fertu*” – see No. 1–4, 9–16) or fishing places (No. 1). Except for the case of Rust (No. 13), all the ‘*iuxta/prope fluvium ferteu*’ mentionings are connected to settlements at the above-mentioned ford (No. 1–4, 9–12, 14–16). The rest of the cases refer to the half of the ‘*tributum*’, tax in the Fertő river (No. 6–8): a donation asked by the citizens of Sopron and donated by the king. Additionally, the early sixteenth-century ‘*Inventarium super fluvium fertheu*’ sounds to have a somewhat similar meaning of the river – since the rights (and the whole area) indeed belonged to the powerful Kanizsai family.

Lake or river? The testimony of other contemporary charters

Thus, with the exception of the reambulation of Podersdorf and the case of Rust, all the ‘*iuxta fluvium fertu*’ settlements were located around the ford. In other cases of Sopron and the *inventaria* no direct evidence is given in the source concerning location, but – as a possible option – there is a good chance that it was also geographically connected to the ford. In the late eighteenth century for example, in contemporary maps or eighteenth–nineteenth century written

evidence,²⁰ certain water flows existed in the above-mentioned area, between Pomogy and Sarród.

What do other circumstances tell us about the question?

Most of the above-mentioned settlements possess other charters as well in which they are mentioned as villages located simply at Fertő or at 'lacus', 'stagnum' Fertő.²¹ The same is true for 'tributum fertew' which exact meaning, as we could already see, has not been properly analyzed and explained yet. Moreover, in the case of charter No. 16, Pomogy village is located as 'Pomagh iuxta lacum seu fluvium ferthew,' thus, among the reference charters in one case (and its transcriptions) the term 'fluvius' is used as a synonym of 'lacus'.²² The Fertő river of the 1520–1522-inventories – in their time – are also without parallel: in all the other remaining late fifteenth-early sixteenth-century *urbaria* and *inventaria* (as well as charters of the same time), if it mentioned at all, Fertő is either alone in its single form or with 'lacus', but never appears with 'fluvius' again.²³

²⁰ See, e.g. MOL S80 No. 4/2; First Military Survey, Coll. V. Sec. 10 (1784), etc.

²¹ See, for example, Rust: Nagy 2: 307 (1441): "*Rwsth penes lacum Fertew;*" Urkony: UB 5: 63 (1344): "*Eghasawrkon ... iuxta lacum Fertew existentis;*" Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 2: 99 (1425): "*Urkon iuxta stagnum Fertew.*" Some of the neighbouring villages of the same period: Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 647 (1411): "*penes lacum Ferthew, que terra Lamperti vocitaretur;*" Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 1: 618 (1410): "*Bala iuxta lacum Ferthew*" (at the ford); UB 4: 246 (1338-referring to Sásóny/Widen am see – A): "*Nouo Predio domini regis et iuxta lacum Fertheu;*" Nagy 2: 48 (1420): "*de possessione seu terra ipsorum Sarod vocata ... iuxta lacum Fertew vocatum;*" etc.

²² Since repetition, the application of words with approximately the same meaning (*dedimus, donavimus et contulimus*), was widely accepted in medieval charters, there is also a possibility that here we encounter the same situation. In legal sense, there is no fundamental difference between such water bodies as rivers or lakes. It is interesting to mention that the *Tripartitum*, the thematic collection of the early sixteenth-century Hungarian customary law (first published in 1517) – referring to water – never uses the word 'lacus', but frequently mentions *aqua*, or *aquarum decursibus*, sometimes also *piscina*, *piscatura* and only once *fluvius*. See S. Kolosvári and K. Óvári, eds., *Magyar Törvénytár. Werbőczy István Hármaskönyve. Corpus Iuris Hungarici. Decretum Tripartitum*, Budapest 1897, Pars 1, Tituli 24, 85, 87, 133; Pars 2, Titulus 14.

²³ Beyond the charter evidence collected in Kiss 1999, we are in the fortunate position that the Fertő-area is probably one of the richest in preserved *inventaria* and *urbaria* in Hungary. Thus, inventories preserved for example from 1492: "*piscaverint...super lacum*" (Dl. 36992) – referring to the domain of Sárvár where *ferthew* in its simple form is mentioned; then the application of the term 'Seemaut' of 1500/1510 (also with reference to the content of the 1526-*urbarium* of Forchtenstein, and whole reference to the Seemaut content of the similarly unpublished *urbarium* of Eisenstadt, 1510) in L. Prickler, *Das älteste Urbar der Grafschaft Forchtenstein von 1500/1510*, Eisenstadt 1998, 9, 116; "*proventus ferthew introitus*", "*Introitus census lacij (or lakw) ferthew*", "*pecunie ferthew introitus*" in 1520, 1521 and 1522 (Dl. 26222) – exactly in the same time as our references inventories mentioning "*fluvius fertew*" – referring to the domain of Sárvár; "*Registrum ... super lacum ferthew*" (1523: Dl. 26264 – domain of Sárvár); 'Seemaut' references of 1515 (Dl. 258610: 144, 232 – domain of Eisenstadt).

Thus, checking the Fertő river charters, one would suggest a relatively clear solution of the Fertő river problem. Since almost all the villages specified by the '*iuxta*' term are located exactly at or near the ford, and even the *tributum* on Fertő river would be understandable if it refers to the ford which was an important fishing area and the best place for crossing the wetland from all directions,²⁴ one would presume that the *fluvius* is an exact geographical location: the ford between Lake Fertő and the connected wetlands of the Hanság.²⁵ On the other hand, in the light of other circumstances, such as the application and meaning of the term '*tributum Fertő*' in a quite clear way, namely as a fishing right, together with the fact that most of our reference settlements were, in other charters, located at '*lacus*' or '*stagnum Fertő*', the above-mentioned conclusion becomes less evident.

Why all these questions are important to study in such a detailed way?

Among others, probably the most important reason is to understand the medieval meaning of '*fluvius*' in its context; whether or not it was such a clear and 'determining' term which may provide us with information precise enough that even the contemporary water level of the Fertő could be detected. Even if there is a possibility that the river meant the ford between the Fertő and the Hanság, the relatively large number of reference charters do not provide clear evidence – thus, the river could mean the whole lake as well. On the basis of all the counted data, therefore, we can state that the '*fluvius Fertő*'-charters clearly do not support the idea of low water level conditions.

It is worth noting that still several other late medieval *urbaria*, referring to the same area can be found in Austrian private collections, especially in the castle of Forchtenstein (related to domains Forchtenstein and Eisenstadt) and probably also in the Cistercian complex of Heiligenkreuz, where chances for access are still rather limited. For the reference of some of these *urbaria*, see Prickler 1998, XXX–XXXI. As we could see earlier, Prickler quotes or refers to the contents of many of these *urbaria* (e.g., the *urbaria* of Forchtenstein, 1526 and Eisenstadt, 1510) in his valuable book.

²⁴ In the high and later middle ages, we have to count with the usage and existence of the road leading from the north (Danube) towards the south, at the eastern shoreline of the lake through Nezsider, Védény, Pátfalu, Ilmic, Valla and Pomogy. Although compared to the main market and military roads of the country it had only secondary importance, still it was far more significant than other roads of local interest in the area. Crossing the ford at Sarród, it led into another important market route of east-west direction, located at the southern shoreline of the lake. See *Allgemeine Landestopographie* 1954, 39. There is a possibility that a charter issued in 1420 (Nagy, *Sopron vármegye*, 2: 48) already refers to the tax (*tributum Fertő*) paid for crossing the ford (similar to several sixteenth-seventeenth-century *Urbaria* of the area where the case is properly described) at Sarród. Nevertheless, since the meaning of this *tributum* can as well refer to the fishing rights, at the moment we cannot draw any adequate conclusions.

²⁵ Since the rivers and streams flowing into Lake Fertő and the western Hanság wetlands had consequently the same names throughout the medieval period, it is not very likely that the '*fluvius*' would have been any of them. Moreover, none of the '*iuxta*' place-names were located at these rivers or streams.

Other than a river? Detecting medieval water level of the Fertő

After all descriptions the question could be raised whether or not there are other, more reliable indicators in the medieval written pieces of evidence which may provide us with contemporary evidence concerning the actual water level conditions of the lake. One of such possibilities is connected to the frequently used hydrological term of the '*fok*'. This Hungarian word in medieval and early modern, modern terminology usually refers to a short water-flow which links two water bodies with each other: one is usually a 'living' water body, in most cases a river, less frequently a lake with its low-plain inundation area located over the banks of the river (or lake).²⁶

Lake Fertő also had at least one *fok*, documented in the 1430s. This *fok* led the water from the Fertő towards its low-lying inundation area, presumably separated by a row of sand dunes. In this inundation area there was at least one fishpond which gained large interest in the 1430s and as such, relatively detailed information is available on its actual state and the way of its utilization in 1434 and 1435.²⁷ The periodic (fish)pond of the Csitvándi family located in the inundation area of the Fertő at its northeastern shorelines nearby the village of Csitvánd (today deserted close to Gols in Austria), entirely depended on the water level conditions of the Lake: in case of low water level, the pond dried up while high water level brought back the water – in this case the basin functioned as a fishpond again.²⁸ In a charter, issued in connection with a legal procedure, it is clearly stated that in 1434 there was not only enough water in the (fish)pond, but the fish was taken away from the pond which suggests a period (at least some months) of higher water level conditions of Lake Fertő.

Fertő as a River – An overview

The earlier, but partly still recent scholarly literature connected the term 'Fertő river' to the low waterlevel of the lake. On the other hand, a hydrologist, Zoltán Károlyi pointed to a definite geographical location, namely the ford of the Lake and the Hanság wetlands as the only possible place of the Fertő river. Thus, in order to decide over the water level-river question, the aim of the present paper was to collect the available evidence referring to the 'River.'

Being mainly local landowners and/or authorities among the interested parties, based on their origin, the people involved in the legal processes were usually well-aware of the geographical conditions of the area the charters

²⁶ See, e.g. B. Andrásfalvy, "A Sárköz és környező Duna menti területek ősi ártéri gazdálkodása és vízhasználata a szabályozás előtt," [Early floodplain management and water exploitation in the Sárköz and neighbouring areas along the Danube] *Vízügyi Történelmi Füzetek* 6 (1973): 74 p.; Z. Fodor, *Az ártéri gazdálkodás fokai a Tisza mentén*. [The fok-s of floodplain management along the Tisza river] I. Magyar Földrajzi Konferencia, Tanulmánykötet CD-ROM, Szeged 2001, 1–10. For the medieval meanings, see e.g. A. Kiss, F. Piti, "A fertői fok," [The 'fok' of Fertő] *Soproni Szemle* 59:2 (2005), 166–168.

²⁷ Df.278003.

²⁸ Kiss-Piti, "A fertői fok," 172–178.

referred to. As far as the geographical distribution is concerned, out of the nineteen cases nine could be directly connected to the above-mentioned ford, while others were either not clearly specified (three) or connected to other settlements along the shoreline of the Lake (in seven cases). Thus, while a clear connection can be detected in the geographical location of the majority of Fertő river mentionings, the existence of other Fertő-river charters suggests that this terminology cannot be automatically connected to the ford, and in the latter cases the 'river' might as well meant the whole lake itself.

At the same time when the 'river' term was used, the Fertő also appeared in charters as a lake or a stagnant body of water and thus, the term cannot be directly connected to the low water levels of the Lake. As such, the 'river' term is not in any sense the signal of the actual low water level of the Fertő. Another, more reliable indicator of the water level can be the case when in the mid-1430s the lake extended to its inundation area and filled up the temporary fishpond of Csitvánd which suggests higher water level conditions of the lake for an unknown period of time.

Matthias Corvinus und das lateinische Quellenwerk des 15. Jahrhunderts in Ungarn

ÉVA TEISZLER



Es ist allgemein bekannt, dass der ungarische König Matthias Corvinus, der mit der Praxis der zeitgenössischen Renaissance-Höfe wohl vertraut war, viel Geld und Mühe der Repräsentation seines Landes, Herrscherhofes und seiner Person selbst widmete. In dieser Absicht präsentierte er sich auch in seiner äußeren Erscheinung als machtvoller und reicher Herrscher, als Mäzen förderte er monumentale Bauarbeiten, sowie wissenschaftliche und kulturelle Vorhaben.¹ Die Bemühung, seine Regierungsgeschichte aus einer vorteilhaften Perspektive dokumentieren zu lassen, zeigt sich auch in den zeitgenössischen Chroniken.²

Die Regierungsjahre des Königs Matthias sind in der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung als eine außergewöhnliche Epoche zu betrachten. Zwar dominierten zu dieser Zeit noch die Königschroniken, deren Ideenwelt sich nach mittelalterlichen Prinzipien richtete, gleichzeitig entstanden aber schon die ersten Dokumente der humanistischen Geschichtsbetrachtung.³ Die mittelalterliche Geschichtstradition in die Erzählungen nach humanistischem Stil wurde in Ungarn anderen europäischen Regionen ähnlich auch von Italienern übertragen.⁴

¹ Siehe dazu: *Potentates and Corvinas. Anniversary Exhibition of the National Széchényi Library* May 16–August 20, ed. O. Karsay, Budapest 2002.

² K. Pajorin, „Humanista irodalmi művek Mátyás király dicsőítésére.” [Humanistische literarische Werke zur Verherrlichung von Matthias Rex] in *Hunyadi Mátyás: Emlékkönyv Mátyás király halálának 500. évfordulójára*, ed. Gy. Rázsó – L. V. Molnár, Budapest 1990, 330–361; S. Graciotti, „Le ascendenze dottrinali dei lodatori italiani di Mattia Corvino.” in *Rapporti veneto-ungheresi all'epoca del Rinascimento*, a cura di T. Klaniczay, Budapest 1975, 51–62.

³ L. Szörényi, „A magyarországi latin humanista történetírás és népnyelvű átalakítása: Antonio Bonfini és Heltai Gáspár.” [Die Umstellung der Ungarischen Lateinischen Humanistischen Geschichtsschreibung: Antonio Bonfini und Gáspár Heltai] in *Philologica Hungarolatina: Tanulmányok a magyarországi neolatin irodalomról*, Budapest 2002, 65–72.

⁴ P. Kulcsár, *Humanista történetírók*. [Humanistische Geschichtsschreiber] Budapest 1977, 1173.

Es ist jedoch festzulegen, dass die gleichzeitige Existenz beider Stile in Ungarn am Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts gleichermaßen berechtigt war. Ein gutes Beispiel dafür ist die *Chronica Hungarorum* von János Thuróczy⁵ aus dem Jahr 1488, die kurz nach seiner ersten Erscheinung auch ein zweites Mal gedruckt wurde. Die Ideenwelt und der Stil von Thuróczy werden von der ungarischen Geschichtsschreibung sehr unterschiedlich beurteilt. Einige betrachten ihn als ein Vorgänger des Humanismus, da ihm die humanistische Rhetorik bekannt war: bei der Darstellung zeitgenössischer Geschehnissen verwendete er die Methoden der *Oratio* und *Laudatio*, und schildert gerne die Schönheit von Naturerscheinungen. Laut dieser Anschauung spielen Fortuna und Fatum eine entscheidende Rolle in seinem Werk.⁶ Andere betonen seinen typischen Stil bei der Konzeption seiner Chronik, sowie seinen Gedankengang mit Gott im Mittelpunkt, die darauf hindeuten sollen, dass es im Falle von Thuróczy um einen mittelalterlichen Verfasser geht.⁷ Im Spannungsbogen dieser Meinungen ist auch die These vertreten, dass er „ein Verfasser des Mittelalters und ein Künstler des Humanismus“ war.⁸

Wegen der unterschiedlichen Beurteilung der Forschung fällt es einem wirklich schwer, eine etablierte Feststellung über das Werk von Thuróczy zu machen, aber letztendlich soll er trotzdem als ein mittelalterlicher Verfasser betrachtet werden. Mit seiner Chronik bezweckte er nämlich nichts Weiteres, als frühere Chroniken fortzusetzen. Seine Arbeitsmethode ist demgemäß als reine Redaktionsarbeit zu betrachten, seine Texte, die überwiegend Kompilationen sind, werden auch von ihm selbst *Chronica* genannt. Und da er die Arbeit schrittweise, nach langem Zureden⁹ anfertigte, scheint er eigentlich keine neue Geschichte Ungarns nach eigenem Konzept verfassen zu wollen. Im Unterschied zu der Vorgeschichte befasst er sich wenig mit seinem eigenen Zeitalter, der seiner mittelalterlich geprägten Meinung nach von anderen Autoren unter Rücksichtnahme auf

⁵ Johannes de Thurocz, *Chronica Hungarorum*. ed. E. Galántai, J. Kristó, Budapest 1985; Johannes de Thurocz, *Chronica Hungarorum, Commentarii*. Composuit E. Mályusz, adiuvante J. Kristó, Budapest 1988; T. Kardos, „Thuróczy János Magyar Krónikája.“ [*Chronica Hungarorum* von Johannes de Thurocz] in *Thuróczy János, Magyar Krónika*. ed. L. Geréb, Budapest 1967, 7–37; J. Kaszák, *Thuróczy János élete és krónikája*. [Chronica und Leben von Johannes de Thurocz] Doktorarbeit, Budapest 1906; E. Mályusz, *A Thuróczy-krónika és forrásai*. [Die Quellen der Chronik von Johannes de Thurocz] Budapest 1967; E. Mályusz, *Thuróczy János krónikája*. [Die Chronik von Johannes de Thurocz] Budapest 1944.

⁶ E. Galántai, *Magyarországi humanista történetírók*. [Humanistische Geschichtsschreiber in Ungarn] Handschrift, Szeged 1999, 67–83.

⁷ P. Kulcsár, „A humanizmus korának műveltsége Magyarországon.“ [Die humanistische Bildung in Ungarn] in *idem*, *Humanista történetírás Magyarországon*. Budapest 2008, 37; P. Kulcsár, „A humanista történetírás,“ [Humanistische Geschichtsschreibung] in *idem*, *Humanista történetírás Magyarországon*, Budapest 2008, 74.

⁸ Gy. Kristó, „Utószó,“ [Nachwort] in J. Thuróczy, *A magyarok krónikája – Rogérius mester: Siralmas ének*, Budapest 2001, 459.

⁹ G. Karsai, „Névtelenség, névrejtés és szerzőnév középkori krónikáinkban,“ *Századok* 97 (1963), 668–669.

den entsprechenden Stil diskutiert werden sollte. Er betrachtet sich selbst also auch als traditioneller Autor, konnte sich jedoch von den Einflüssen nicht frei machen, die seine nächste Umgebung am Hofe des Königs Matthias prägten.

Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass Petrus Ransanus Bischof von Lucera die Chronik von Thuróczy von Königin Beatrix bekam¹⁰, um dieses Werk¹¹ bei der Arbeit an der ersten ungarischen Geschichte nach Kriterien des Humanismus zu benutzen. Ransanus traf kurz nach der Anfertigung der *Chronica Hungarorum* als Gesandter des Königs Ferdinand I. aus Sizilien ein. Er setzte sich fast unverzüglich zur Aufgabe, das Werk von Thuróczy neu zu gestalten. Im Falle des geschichtsbezogenen Teils exzerpiert er die *Chronica Hungarorum*, aber hinsichtlich der zeitgenössischen Geschehnisse greift er auch zu mündlichen Quellen.¹² Es wurde von mehreren Forschern festgestellt, dass Ransanus seine Quellen grundlegend nach seinem eigenen Stil bearbeitete. Demgemäß ist es durchaus schwierig, seine Quellen Titel für Titel nachzuvollziehen, überdies ist seine schriftstellerische Technik auch sehr kompliziert.¹³ Er engagierte sich tatsächlich allein für die Bearbeitung der ungarischen Chroniktradition nach humanistischem Vorbild. Diese Feststellung wird auch dadurch unterstützt, dass er bei der linearen Darstellung der Ereignisse nichts Weiteres hinzufügen hat, als Thuróczy. Beispielsweise im Falle der Geschichte des Krieges von Matthias Corvinus gegen Österreich bleibt er sogar bei dem Jahr 1477 stehen, obwohl Thuróczy auch die Eroberung von Wien im Jahre 1485 ausführlich behandelte. Gleichzeitig kommt er den Erfordernissen von Thuróczy entgegen, als er zum Schluss seines Werkes die Gründe des Krieges gegen Österreich schildert.

Die Chronik von Thuróczy als eine der wichtigsten Quellen wird auch von Antonio Bonfini nach den Prinzipien des Humanismus rezipiert. Bonfini als höfischer Geschichtsschreiber von Matthias Corvinus verfasste ein ausführliches Werk über die ungarische Geschichte unter dem Titel *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*.¹⁴ Bonfini leistete gründliche Vorarbeiten in diesem Thema¹⁵, in seinem *De-*

¹⁰ *Cum superioris anni hyeme Viennae agerem, tua Beatrix regina sapientissima tradidit mihi legendum codicem quendam...* Petrus Ransanus, *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, ed. P. Kulcsár, Budapest 1977, 27.

¹¹ Petrus Ransanus, *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, Curam gerebat: P. Kulcsár, Budapest 1977.

¹² L. Blazovich-E. Sz. Galántai, „Utószó,” [Nachwort] in P. Ransanus, *A magyarok történetének rövid foglalata*, Budapest 1999, 207–208.

¹³ L. Veszprémy, „Ransanus krónikája Géza–Szt. István fejezetének forrásproblémája,” [Die Chronik von Petrus Ransanus und das Problem vom Kapitel Géza – Heiliger Stephan] *Magyar Könyvszemle* 106 (1990), 106–107, 111; P. Kulcsár, „Ransanus Szent István-életrajzáról,” [Von der Heiliger Stephan Biografie von Petrus Ransanus] *Magyar Könyvszemle* 107 (1991), 307–308; T. Kardos, *Pietro Ransano in Ungheria*, Roma 1946, 10.

¹⁴ Antonius de Bonfinis, *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*, ed. I. Fögel–B. Iványi–L. Juhász, Lipsiae–Budapest 1936–1976.

¹⁵ L. Szörényi, „Magyar történelmi vonatkozások Bonfini Symposionjában,” [Ungarische Hinweise in Bonfini Symposion.] in *idem, Harmóniára teremtve: Tanulmányok Mátyás királyról*, Budapest 2009, 117–129.

cadés bezog er sich auf zahlreiche ausländische Autoren, Archivquellen und mündliche Erzählungen. Die von ihm benutzte umfangreiche literarische Quellenbasis wurde von Péter Kulcsár nachgewiesen.¹⁶

Eine weitere Schilderung der von anderen Forschern schon eingehend untersuchten Fragen würde jedoch die Rahmen dieses Beitrags sprengen.¹⁷ Im Folgenden soll daher die Frage, auf welcher Art und Weise Mathias Corvinus von diesen drei, von ihm angestellten Autoren charakterisiert wurde, unter die Lupe genommen werden.

Wie es schon früher erwähnt wurde, ist für die Arbeitsmethode von Thuróczy die Kompositionstechnik nach mittelalterlicher Art charakteristisch; ihm bleiben die Methoden der typisch humanistischen Geschichtsschreibung völlig fremd. Das Herrscherportrait vom König Matthias wird vor allem durch seine Taten geschildert. Nur eine einzige Textstelle gibt es in der ganzen Chronik, wo der Charakter des Königs behandelt wird. Es ist sehr interessant, dass der großartige Charakter von Matthias Corvinus genau durch die Worte von Mohamed, seinem Feind geschildert wird. Die *Oratio obliqua* deutet auf einen ehrenvollen Gegner hin.¹⁸

Die expansive Politik von Mathias Corvinus wird positiv bewertet, nämlich der König brachte sich wieder zu einem neuen Feldzug auf, sobald er zu Hause ankam. Laut Thuróczy kam der König immer siegreich von der Schlacht an, unabhängig davon, welcher Feldzug konkretisiert wird.¹⁹ Das Wohlwollen von

¹⁶ P. Kulcsár, *Bonfini magyar történetének forrásai és keletkezése*. [Die Quellen und Entstehung von Bonfini *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*] Budapest 1973; P. Kulcsár, *Antonio Bonfini Magyar történetének forrásai és keletkezése*. [Die Quellen und Entstehung von Bonfini *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*] Szeged 1970.

¹⁷ P. Kulcsár, „Antonio Bonfini és műve,” [Antonio Bonfini und sein Werk] in *idem, Humanista történetírás Magyarországon*. Budapest 2008, 94–107; L. Szörényi, „A magyarországi latin humanista történetírás és népnyelvű átalakítása.” [Die Umstellung der Ungarischen Lateinischen Humanistischen Geschichtsschreibung: Antonio Bonfini und Gáspár Heltai] in *idem, Harmóniára teremtve: Tanulmányok Mátyás királyról*. Budapest 2009, 131–140; P. Kulcsár, „A humanizmus korának műveltsége Magyarországon,” [Die humanistische Bildung in Ungarn] in *idem, Humanista történetírás*, 39–40.

¹⁸ „Nulla homine in hoc est natura, que eundem regnare dedignaretur, nam cunctos sui evi Christianos inter principes ipse unus est, qui alta facinorum cum gloria sui regiminis dirigit officium. [...] Nonne et cesar Thurcorum Machumetes [...] rege de isto dixisse fertur: Ego et ipse, inquit, sumus omnes mundi inter principes, digne principis nomine qui vocamur. Nonne est, ut principem esse decet, in consiliis peridoneus, in delinquentes clemens atque permisericors, in rebus regni administrandis solers et providus, animo strennuus, magna et ardua agredi audax, in laboribus tollerandis infatigabilis, in eventibus precogitandis preveniendisque perspicuus, in periculis evitandis cautus, in hostis insidiis consiliisque denudandis et pervertendis sagax, in omni re militari ac in cunctis sui regiminis exercitiis miro modo instructus, dissimulandi magister, glorie usque ad finitum avidus et ranquam regnare natus?” *Chronica Hungarorum*, 285–286.

¹⁹ „Harum demum rerum post expeditionem nondum equorum suorum sudore desiccato [...] Abhinc vero milite quiete minime rectato Moldauiam versus [...] suorum flexit habenas equorum.” *Chronica Hungarorum*, 287.

Matthias dem Feind gegenüber wird als ein positiver Charakterzug dargestellt,²⁰ im letzten Kapitel der Chronik schreibt Thuróczy über das Reichtum und Ruhm von Matthias Corvinus.²¹

Ransanus verwendet hingegen eine völlig andere Methode bei der Darstellung der Persönlichkeit des Königs. Dabei hat er die Absicht, den Voraussetzungen der humanistischen Erudition Genüge zu tun. In Zusammenhang damit greift er zur *Laudatio*, die sich oft nach *Adulatio* neigt. Bei der Schilderung des königlichen Charakters benutzt er überdies auch solche Attribute (*Hyperbolae*) gerne, die allein im Superlativ gebräuchlich sind:

divus Mathias, potentissimus et sapientissimus rex, rex optime; praestantissimus maiestas, Hungarorum potentissime rex, Hungarorum rex potentissimus et invictissimus; Christianissime rex, rex prudentissime, sapientissime rex, felicissime princeps, rex fortissimus, vir strenuissimus, humanissime rex.

Der Stil und die Verfassungsmethode von Ransanus werden auch dadurch erfassbar, dass er die Epitheta oft als Anrede verwendet. Mit Hilfe dieser verweist er gleichzeitig auf die Rollen, in denen er später den Herrscher darstellen möchte. In seiner Rede an Matthias Corvinus behandelt Ransanus den Charakter des Königs, der auch als ein humanistisches Herrscherideal interpretiert werden kann.²² Ferner die Herrscherrolle als Verteidiger der Christenheit dar, was auch von Bonfini übernommen wurde.²³

Darauf folgt die Behandlung der wichtigsten Tugenden des Königs in dichter Reihenfolge durch kürzere oder längere Schilderungen: er stellt die Großzügigkeit, das Reichtum und das Wohlwollen des Königs den Fremden gegenüber dar, ferner befasst er sich mit seinem weltweit bekannten Ruhm, mit seiner Weisheit, Bildung und mit seinen Kenntnissen über Philosophie, Astronomie und Kunst, mit seiner weisen Vorsorge, mit seinem christlichen Glaubenseifer, sowie mit seiner Kühnheit im Kampf und mit seinen hervorragenden Fähigkeiten als Feld-

²⁰ „[...] dominus rex Mathias regem Polonie suum in papilionem introductum cunctis eiusdem regis polonie comitibus [...] domini regis Mathie tum dignitatis liberalitatem tum sui directionem admirantibus et stupentibus delicata tractavit hospitalitate.“ *Chronica Hungarorum*, 291.

²¹ „Domus thauernicalis et mensa regis huius tantis ornatibus et clenodiis, tantis apparatibus tantisque aueris et argenteis nitet vasis et poculis, ut nullus regum Hungarie in his rebus tam gloriosus fuisse credatur [...] Prefulgida rege de hoc per orbem fama volat...“ *Chronica Hungarorum*, 292.

²² „Tua est iustitia, cuius virtutis splendor est maximus, et ex qua boni viri nominantur teste oratorum principe Cicerone [...], tua est fortitudo, [...] Tua est magnanimitas, mansuetudo, modestia, temperantia, humanitas, urbanitas, vericitas [...] Nec putes, me praetermisse liberalitatem, quae virtus maxima tua est [...]“ *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, 51.

²³ „Ex omnibus autem, quae supra in multiplices laudes tuas explicui, hoc praecipuum tuae virtuti gloriaeque tribuitur, quod inter principes Christianos tu solus es, qui et scis et audes vincere Turcas [...] Eam ob rem in tua virtute tuisque conatibus ac formidanda potentia sita est spes totius rei publicae Christianae, tu veluti murus inexpugnabilis munitumque ac validissimum es propugnaculum, quod efferatae rabiei gentis impiae atque truculentae (ne in Italiam inque ceteras occidentalium cultorum regiones irruat, saeviat) obiiicitur.“ *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, 53–54.

herr.²⁴ Ebenso wird seine Weisheit in seinem frühen Alter angedeutet.²⁵ Seine Talentiertheit wird als elterliche Erbe dargestellt.²⁶

Die von Thuróczy einfach formulierten positiven Eigenschaften, die den König als geschaffen für Regierung darstellen, werden von Ransanus in Tugenden umgestaltet. Ransanus bemüht sich mit dem gleichen Eifer darum, diese mit solchen, von ihm selbst für wichtig gehaltenen, positiven Charakterzügen zu ergänzen, die sich aus dem Virtus-Begriff des Humanismus ableiten lassen. Es ist äußerst bemerkenswert, wie sehr er sich darum bemüht, die Worte von Thuróczy durch Synonyme nach seinem eigenen Stil zu ersetzen, oder die im Hintergrund der Ereignisse liegende liebenswürdige Schilderung in Attribute zu verdichten. Ransanus legt einen speziellen Wert darauf, den Charakter von Matthias Corvinus nach seinem eigenen Wertsystem zu gestalten. Dies kann man durch die Schilderung der Neigung von Matthias Corvinus zur Astrologie und zu Glaubensfragen klar sehen.

Für das Werk *Epithome* ist die übertrieben lobpreisende, lebenshafte Darstellung charakteristisch, nicht so aber die *Decades* von Bonfini. In Bonfinis Werk ist das Portrait von Matthias Corvinus gemäß humanistischen Richtlinien auch nach dem Prinzip „Virtus“ gestaltet, aber unter dem Vorwand der Neutralität verzichtet er auf das häufige Benutzen von Superlativen. Betreffend den christlichen Glaubenseifer und den Glauben an Astrologie des Königs verlässt er sich auf Ransanus, während er anscheinend gut mit der oben zitierten Rede von Thuróczy zurechtkommt.²⁷

Für die schriftstellerische Vorgehensweise von Bonfini ist es charakteristisch, dass er durch die Konversation seiner Figuren klar erfassbare Charakterschilderungen zum Ausdruck bringt, oder bestimmte Personen miteinander vergleicht. Ein geeignetes Beispiel für die zuerstgenannte Methode ist die Rede von Mihály Szilágyi vor der Ernennung von Matthias zum König.²⁸ Für die zweite Methode

²⁴ *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, 27–46.

²⁵ „[...] est quidem Mathias adolescens aetate sed prudentia senex [...]“ *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, 162.

²⁶ „[...] in puerili aetate erat tanta corporis dexteritate tantaque excellentia ingenii eratque adeo ornatus aliquot aliis virtutibus, quibus bene instituti pueri praediti esse solent [...]“ *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*, 156. S. noch: L. Szörényi, „Attila strumento did diplomazia – Janus Pannonius ambasciatore di Mattia a Roma.“ *Nuova Corvina* 20 (2008), 16–29.

²⁷ *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*, Decas III., Liber IX. 180.

²⁸ „Cum externis competitoribus repulsam omnino dandam esse iudicem, si de Ungaris optio est habenda, Mathiam ego Corvinum eligendum esse censeo, ut, veluti patre tot annos gubernante ab intestinis externisque malis omnibus liberati sumus, ita imperante filio nos in posterum liberemur. Quam fauste ac genere sit indolis, quam divino ingenio et quanta animi magnitudine ac laudis ardore nunc estuet, sat cuique vestrum constare puto. Non a patre, mihi credite, degenerabit, cum paterno nomine ac laude certabit; in castris natus est, altus in sago, in veteranorum contuberniis educatus a teneris hic didicit unguiculis Turcorum tumultus et aciem non expavescere, pugnare sub vinea et centurionis precepta servare, ab equo ac pedibus iuxta dimicare, ad palum quotidie exerceri, transnare sepe danubium et per frigus et estum sub galea diem ac noctem agere, laboris et inedia fieri patientissimum, nil magis quam hostilem aspectum anhelare, singulari certamine admodum delectari, in castris cum sociis simulacrum

ist die Gegenüberstellung der Charakterzüge von Kaiser Friedrich und Mathias Corvinus ein gutes Beispiel.²⁹ In der Rede von Szilágyi wird eine spezielle Bedeutung den mündlichen Informationsquellen von Ransanus beigelegt. Im Falle des Vergleichs bezüglich der zwei Herrscher wird der ethische Vorrang von Matthias Corvinus vor dem Kaiser Friedrich durch die Gegenüberstellung des humanistischen Virtus-Ideals und dem entgegengesetzten Otium hervorgehoben. Ransanus gewann endgültig die Sympathie des Lesers für Matthias Corvinus durch das Bild des schlaun und spaßhaften Herrschers, das ebenso von Galeotto³⁰ stammte.³¹ Dieser Tatsache muss eine besondere Bedeutung beigegeben werden, da

quotidie belli agere, nil ignavia et desidia magis abominari, contra nil bello plus appetere. Accedit ingentia mansuetudo, pietas et morum elegantia cum summa honestate coniuncta, religio insuper ingens et intempestiva sapientia. Nisi per huc veluti per patrem in communem salutem asseramur, nil profecto aliud succurrit, quo spes nostras certius intendamus. Nisi ad sanctas Corvini reliquias confugiamus, nos cetera consilia defecere. Neque oblivioni tradendum est, quid immortalia divi patris beneficia nunc exposcant, qui dum vixit, preter gloriam virtute sua partam nihil pro servato regno, pro defensata semper Christiana republica, pro cesis, fuis fugatisque totiens olim Turcis premii vivus accepit, livor edax omnia denegavit, quin etiam, nisi sat ipse sibi iam cavisset, extremis hunc invidia supplicii affecisset. Quidnam a nobis peteret, si loqui posset? nimirum clarissimus propugnator ille vester nil aliud pro tot immortalibus in vos meritis postulare, nisi ut infandam turpitudinem, quam ex iniquissima filii cede intulistis, quando nil prohibuistis, honestissima Mathie electione deleatis." in Rerum Ungaricarum decades, Decas III, Liber IX. 30–65.

²⁹ „Mathias enim suapte natura liberalis et magnificus, laudis plus equo cupidus et appetentissimus honoris, cui summa animi magnitudo et promptus ad pericula preclaraque facinora semper inerat animus; contra Fridericus imperator non modo parvus et frugi, sed avarus et plus pecuniarum, quam honoris appetens ad magna Christiane reipublice commoda vel sua vel aliena culpa animum nunquam extulit. Ille bellicosus et impiger, laboris et inedia tolerandissimus; hic otii et quietis amator, quin et plus equo negligens, desidiosus et tardus. Ille clarissimorum principum emulator semper cum antiquorum laude certavit; hic invidus quandoque habitus nobilia aliorum facinora interceptit, in pace bellum, in bello pacem optare solitus fuit et nulla min utroque constantiam retinere. Illi liberum ingenium, Mars apertus, animus ad pacem bellumque perfacilis; huic arte, consilio, calliditate et pro iudicio cuncta suo gerere placuit et nihil consiliis amicorum tribuere, demum ad utrunque difficilis. Illius vita lautissima, apparatus Persicus et usurpata ex vino animi relaxatio neque humanarum inimicus voluptatum; huius cultus modicus, continentissimus fuit animus, inimicus crapularum, quin semper abstemius hydropotesque perpetuus, solitudinis et contemplationis amator. Illum sales, ioci et amicorum consuetudo nimis declaravit, hunc vita recondita, severa, tristis et a suorum consuetudine admodum aliena. Rex denique pre ingenii probitate facile cuncta remittere, omnia quidem absumere, ut e regno nihil imminuat, plus honorem, quam pecuniam amare, preterea letus, hilaris et iucundus ac ad omnia promptus; imperator pertinacia omnia perpeti et iacturam parvi facere, adversarium obstinatione defatigare, malle omnia perdere, quam nummum ex arca pomere, pecuniis potius, quam sociis parcere, sperare cunctando instaurari omnia et a rigiditate solitudineque sua non recedere." in Rerum Ungaricarum decades, Decas IV, Liber IV, 100–120.

³⁰ Galeottus Martius Narniensis, *De egregie, sapienter et iocose dictis ac factis Mathiae regis*, ed. L. Juhász, Lipsiae 1934.

³¹ E. Békés, „Galeotto Marzio and the Court of King Matthias Corvinus (De egregie, sapienter, iocose dictis ac factis regis Mathiae)," in *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 29 (2009),

die Folkloretradition um die Gestalt von Matthias Corvinus nach seinem Tode zum Teil auf das Werk von Galeotto zurückgeht.³²

Zusammenfassend kann man feststellen, dass der König einen großen Wert darauf legte, talentierte Autoren zu gewinnen und zu unterstützen, um seine Politik nach eigener Vorstellung vorteilhaft präsentieren zu können. Die Fachliteratur sieht hier eine bewusste Repräsentationsabsicht des Königs dem Ausland gegenüber manifestieren, doch konnte Matthias Corvinus auch in seinem eigenen Land auf die Propaganda nicht verzichten. Ein weiteres wichtiges Dokument in dieser Hinsicht ist die Chronik von Dubnic, die ebenfalls unter seiner Regierung verfasst wurde.³³ Die von dem anonymen Autor dargestellte Portrait steht in völligem Widerspruch mit dem propagandistischen Idealbild des Königs, das von den höfischen Autoren von Matthias Corvinus geschildert wurde. Durch sein spontanes Herrscherportrait wird eine allgemeine negative Stimmung im Land deutlich. Folglich ist es festzustellen, dass der Autor die für ihn bemerkenswerten Ereignisse nachträglich notierte und sein Werk mit einem spontan klingenden Abschluss beendete.

287-296, *idem*, „Physiognomy in the Descriptions and Portraits of King Matthias Corvinus,” *Acta Historiae Artium* 46 (2005), 51-97.

³² I. Kriza, *A Mátyás-hagyomány évszázadai*. [Die Jahrhunderte der Matthias Tradition] Budapest 2007.

³³ *Chronicon Dubnicense* cum codicibus Sambuci Acephalo et Vaticano, cronicisque Vindobonensi Picto et Budensi accurate collatum. Accesserunt Adnotationes chronologicae seculi XII et XIII-i, Chronicon Monacense, Chronicon Zagradiense et Varadiense, Joannis de Utino brevis narratio de regibus Hungariae, ed. M. Florianus, *Quinque-Ecclesiis* 1884, 1-204.

Fiscal and Military Developments in Hungary during the Jagello Period

MARTYN RADY*



Introduction

There can scarcely be many occasions when a single article not only challenges most contemporary scholarship on a historical period but also obliges a reconsideration of views and opinions held for almost half a millennium. This achievement belongs to a young Czech scholar, who in the course of his research on late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth-century Hungary has found and published several neglected manuscripts relating to the size and composition of the Hungarian army at the time of Mohács. In the journal *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*,¹ Antonín Kalous draws attention to new evidence relating to Hungarian participation in the battle and to the losses sustained, as well as to a description of the royal army as it processed ceremonially from Buda on 20 July, 1526, little more than a month before its fatal engagement.

Although Kalous eschews analysis of the figures and descriptions given in the sources he has uncovered, the evidence he presents has the following implications. First, and as some historians have already argued, it is plain that the Hungarian army was of substantial size by contemporary standards, numbering, even though not at full strength, some 25,000 combatants by the time of the battle.² Secondly, it had been adjusted to fight the Turks by the inclusion in its ranks not only of hussars but also of a significant number of infantry. The ratio of cavalry to

* The present essay is partly based on the author's introductory essay to *The Laws of Hungary, 1490–1526*, ed. and trans. P. Banyó, Zs. Hunyadi and M. Rady, with the assistance of J. Bak, *Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae* [henceforth DRMH], Vol. 4, Budapest–Idyllwild, forthcoming. An earlier version of this essay was delivered in November 2009 to the Late Medieval Research Seminar at Trinity College Dublin. The author is grateful for the insightful criticism that he received on this occasion.

¹ A. Kalous, "Elfeledett források a mohácsi csatáról: Antonio Burgio pápai nuncius jelentései, és azok hadtörténelmi jelentősége," [The forgotten sources on the battle of Mohács: The reports of papal nuncio Antonio Burgio and their importance for military history] *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 120:2 (2007), 603–621.

² B. J. Szabó, "A mohácsi csata és a 'hadügyi forradalom'," [The Battle of Mohács and the "Military Revolution"] *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 117 (2004), 450–55; *ibid.*, 118 (2005), 573–627.

foot soldiers is likely thus to have been around the 6:4 ratio previously estimated by András Kubinyi.³ The deployment of a relatively large infantry force, most of whom appear to have been harquebusiers and pikemen, comports with accounts of the battle that describe the Hungarian line as being drawn up in an integrated formation with blocks of infantry supporting squadrons of cavalry.⁴ Thirdly, the Hungarian army was well supplied and equipped. According to the information given by Kalous, its provisions were conveyed by some 5000 waggons, which might also be deployed on the field as a *Wagenburg*, a form of defense the Turks especially feared.⁵ Accompanying the army were 85 cannon and 500 smaller guns (*barbatos pragenses*). Some of the infantry are described as bearing pavises "as big as a man" while others were armored and carried pikes tipped with iron. In reviewing Kalous's findings, the military historian László Veszprémy concludes that the Hungarian army at Mohács had at its disposal "all the modern military innovations of the age."⁶ The Hungarian army may, as it turned out, have lost in battle against the Turks, but in terms of its numbers and composition it was plainly a formidable fighting force.

Ever since 1526, Mohács has served as the prism through which the Jagello kingdom has been viewed and as a verdict on the larger failure of its rulers, Wladislas II (1490–1516) and his son, Louis II (1516–26). Both contemporaries and historians have thus been apt to contrast the supposed indignities of Jagello rule with the achievements of Matthias Corvinus (1458–90). In so doing, they have frequently drawn attention to the decline in the royal revenues after 1490 which, we are told, meant that the kingdom was unable to maintain the military strength it had previously possessed. In support of this contention, we are often assured – quite wrongly – that the Hungarian revenues under Matthias had equaled those of the kings of France.⁷ Once we acknowledge, however, that Hungary's military

³ A. Kubinyi, "The Battle of Szávaszentdemeter-Nagyolaszi (1523): Ottoman Advance and Hungarian Defence on the Eve of Mohács," in G. Dávid, P. Fodor, eds. *Ottomans, Hungarians and Habsburgs in Central Europe: The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Advance*, London 2000, 85.

⁴ "Tomoreo distese à longa fronte tutte le genti in squadra, interponendo battaglioni de fanti tra li squadroni de cavalli, acciò non fussero sì facilmente circondati dalla moltitudine de turchi, et missa quella poca artiglieri c'havea in lochi opportune." P. Giovio, *Commentarii delle cose de Turche*. Venice 1541, fol. 29r. For Giovio and his knowledge of the 1526 campaign, see V. J. Parry, "Renaissance Historical Literature in Relation to the Near and Middle East (with special reference to Paolo Giovio)," in B. Lewis, P. M. Holt, eds. *Historians of the Middle East*, London 1962, 286. A translation into Hungarian is provided in B. J. Szabó, *Mohács*. Budapest 2006, 158–159.

⁵ C. Imbert, *The Ottoman Empire: The Structure of Power*. New York–Basingstoke 2002, 269.

⁶ L. Veszprémy, "The state and military affairs in east-central Europe, 1380–c. 1520s," in F. Tallett, D. J. B. Trim, eds. *European Warfare, 1350–1750*, Cambridge 2010, 109.

⁷ The myth that the Hungarian royal income in the 1480s was equivalent to the income of the king of France rests on Marino Sanuto's *Diarii*, and found its way into Hungarian literature through Dezső Csánki, "I. Mátyás udvara," [The Court of Matthias I] *Századok* 17 (1883), 525. The French royal income was in fact equivalent to about 4 million florins per year in the late fifteenth century, more than five times Matthias's.

capability under the Jagello rulers was actually quite considerable and the kingdom able to field an army that counted amongst the most numerous and best equipped in Christendom, then we must necessarily reconsider the capacity of the kingdom to wage war. It is the purpose of this essay to review the resources available to the Jagello kings, to reconsider the fiscal-military arrangements that prevailed in the kingdom after 1490, and in conclusion to offer some more general observations on the relationship between these arrangements and the kingdom's larger organization. In this way, we would hope to tease out the importance of Kalous's discoveries for late medieval Hungary as a whole.

Finance: Exemptions and Expedients

Estimates of the royal income and expenditure for the Jagello period largely derive from brief statements and jottings that are, almost literally, "back of the envelope" calculations.⁸ Designed for the most part to convince the diet to agree to further supply or to convince foreigners that Hungary was needful of financial support, they should be treated with caution.⁹ Generally, they seem to agree that the royal income wavered at around 200,000 florins – split more or less evenly between ordinary revenue and extraordinary taxes – and this remains the figure that most historians usually quote as the royal income.¹⁰ It is indeed a very low sum – about £40,000 in the English money of the time, which was smaller than the English crown's revenue even in bad years.¹¹ Moreover, even excluding the income that Matthias had derived from his foreign conquests – Silesia, Moravia and Lower Austria – it is considerably less than that previously obtained in Hungary during the 1480s, possibly by up to two-thirds.¹²

⁸ The majority of these calculations come from Venetian accounts. See I. Balogh, *Veleneczei diplomaták Magyarországról (1500–1526)*. [Venetian Diplomats on Hungary] Szeged 1929, vii–viii, xvi, xxviii–ix, lxxvii.

⁹ Zs. Hermann, "Államháztartás és a pénz értéke a Mohács előtti Magyarországon," [Domestic economy and the value of money in Hungary before Mohács] *Századok* 109 (1975), 303, 320; A. Kubinyi, "Magyarország hatalmasai és a török veszély a Jagelló-korban," [The magnates of Hungary and the Turkish threat in the Jagello period] in idem, *Nándorfehérvártól Mohácsig. A Mátyás és a Jagelló-kor hadtörténete*. Budapest 2007, 239.

¹⁰ Summarized in A. Kubinyi, "Hungary's Power Factions and the Turkish Threat in the Jagellonian Period (1490–1526)," in I. Zombori, ed. *Fight Against the Turk in Central Europe in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century*. Budapest 2004, 121–123.

¹¹ G. Harriss, *Shaping the Nation: England 1360–1461*. Oxford 2005, 61. Conversion of currencies is facilitated by the equivalence of the Hungarian florin and the ducat which was recognized even at the time: see Hungarian National Archive, *Collectio Antemohacsiana*, Dl.15475.

¹² For the royal revenues in the 1480s, see I. Draskóczy, "King Matthias' Revenue and the Royal Treasury," in P. Farbaký, ed. *Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court, 1458–1490*. Budapest 2008, 284; J. M. Bak, "Monarchie im Wellental. Materielle Grundlagen des ungarischen Königtums im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert," in R. Schneider, ed. *Das spätmittelalterliche Königtum im Europäischen Vergleich*. Vorträge und Forschungen 32, Sigmaringen 1987, 359–360.

The problem that Hungary faced was commonplace throughout Europe. Since the thirteenth century and the birth of the noble estate in Hungary, the nobility had been exempt from taxation. The Hungarian nobleman's privileged status was deeply entrenched - so much so that when Sigismund in 1434 laid a fiftieth tax on all noble incomes to pay for the Hussite wars, he had to promise never to repeat the levy.¹³ Accordingly, the list of the cardinal liberties of Hungarian nobles, provided in the principal legal text of this period, Werbőczy's *Tripartitum* of 1517, included that "they are entirely exempt and free of all servile obligations, and of paying taxes and dues, tolls, customs and the thirtieth; and they need only serve under arms in defense of the realm."¹⁴ As Werbőczy's explanation suggests, the nobleman's exemption from taxation arose from his personal commitment to serve the ruler at time of war. The law of 1498 accordingly explained in respect of the nobles' exemption that their ancestors had "won and defended this realm by the shedding of their blood and who and whose descendants still have to defend and protect it."¹⁵ As it happened, however, the descendants did nothing of the sort, for the *insurrectio*, the collective mobilization of the whole nobility for war, might only serve *in extremis* and on Hungarian soil.¹⁶ Accordingly, it had long fallen into desuetude, surviving only in rhetoric and in the general muster that accompanied some meetings of the diet.¹⁷ The failure of the kingdom's nobles to perform their traditional function as warriors and to protect ordinary folk from Turkish raiders was a criticism leveled at them during the peasant uprising of 1514.¹⁸

The nobility's exemption from taxation rested upon an outmoded formulation of its members' role as knights in the king's service. The impact of this exemption upon the medieval Hungarian kingdom was, however, substantial. Noble wealth accumulated over generations in the form of coin, jewelry, money lent out, herds and flocks, was not subject to a moveables tax. Nor was the income taxable that the nobleman obtained from his peasant tenants in the form of dues in kind, the "ninth" on produce (where it was paid), tolls, mills and payments in lieu of labor services. Given that there were about 300,000 peasant households in Hungary

¹³ E. Mályusz, "Les débuts du vote de la taxe par les ordres dans la Hongrie féodale," *Nouvelles Études Historiques*. 2 vols, Budapest 1965, 1: 60.

¹⁴ *Tripartitum*, I, 9 [4] (available with parallel English-language translation as Stephen Werbőczy: *The Customary Law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary in Three Parts*. ed. J. M. Bak, P. Banyó and M. Rady, Budapest-Idyllwild 2005, published as DRMH 5. *ibid.*, 57).

¹⁵ 1498: 35 (references in this form refer to the laws of the realm, as given in the *Corpus Juris Hungarici*).

¹⁶ 1492: 18, 19; 1498: 17.

¹⁷ The *insurrectio* is mentioned in the laws of this period as if still an institution of war. See thus 1492: 18-9; 1498: 17; 1518 (Tolna): 2; 1526: 9. Although many nobles joined the colors in the 1526 campaign, a general levy was not summoned.

¹⁸ J. M. Bak, "Delinquent Lords and Forsaken Serfs: Thoughts on War and Society during the Crisis of Feudalism," in St. B. Vardy, A. Huszar Vardy, eds. *Society in Change: Studies in Honor of Béla K. Király*, Boulder and New York 1983, 291-292, 294-296.

paying annually between two and four florins to their lords, we can estimate that about a million florins flowed every year into noble coffers that was not being directly taxed.¹⁹ Moreover, because the nobles were left untaxed, they had no great incentive to extract additional dues from their peasants. As a consequence, the burden falling upon the peasantry in terms of what they owed to their lords was relatively light – about five per cent of their average income.²⁰ In short, because of the nobles' exemption from taxation, the wealth of the Hungarian countryside went largely untapped.

There were some obvious ways by which to compensate for this deficiency, of the type to which most European rulers had resort. The alienation of lands and revenues was a standard recourse and one which the diet identified as a major cause of the hemorrhaging of the royal income.²¹ An easy alternative was to extract loans that were eventually paid off with such properties as might from time to time escheat to the crown.²² By 1516, Wladislas II had accumulated debts of possibly 400,000 florins in this way, and his son continued to raise loans even though the lenders knew that they had little chance of speedy repayment.²³ Nevertheless, while rulers elsewhere in Europe might acquire the bulk of their revenue from taxing the cities and trade, this was not possible in Hungary. Certainly, Hungary had a lively commerce and wealthy merchant class, sustained primarily by the export of metals and cattle.²⁴ Merchant capital was, however, difficult to tax, for the great venturers were often foreigners, from Nuremberg, Vienna and Augsburg. If pressed, they might withdraw their trade and ingenuity and bring commerce and mining industry to a halt. Accordingly, the loans extracted from them, although amounting to several hundred thousand florins over the 1520s,²⁵ were never as burdensome as the income tax or benevolences of Tudor England. For their part, native merchants often bought their way into the nobility, thus putting their wealth outside the reach of royal and urban taxation.

¹⁹ The number of peasant plots derives from A. Kubinyi, "A magyar királyság népesége a 15. század végén," [Population of the kingdom of Hungary at the end of the 15th century] in ed. J. Kovácsics, *Magyarország történeti demográfiája (896–1995)*. Budapest 1997, 105. The value of peasant payments to lords is hard to quantify with any certainty as a significant part might be paid in kind or services, but was seldom less than a florin in cash per plot. See L. Kredics, L. Solymosi, *A veszprémi püspökség 1524. évi urbárium*. Budapest 1993.

²⁰ Á. Nógrády, "A földesúri adó és az adózás elve a késő középkori Magyarországon," [Seigniorial tax and the basis of taxation in late medieval Hungary] in A. Kubinyi, J. Laszlovszky, P. Szabó, *Gazdaság és gazdálkodás a középkori Magyarországon: gazdaságtörténet, anyagi kultúra, régészet*. Budapest 2008, 373.

²¹ 1492: 27; 1514: 1; 1518 (Bács): 9, 18, 45; 1521: 3.

²² More complicatedly, escheated estates might be pledged in return for cash and then the pledge itself used to reimburse an existing loan, thus netting the king a double profit.

²³ J. Fögel, *II. Lajos udvartartása 1516–1526*. [The Court of Louis II] Budapest 1917, 16–18.

²⁴ See P. Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary*, tr. T. Pálosfalvi, London–New York 2001, 323–325.

²⁵ Fögel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 16–17.

Let us take just one famous example of this. Already by the 1450s, John Ernuszt, a converted Jew from Vienna, was recorded as a merchant of Buda.²⁶ He seems to have made his money selling goods to the court. On account of his business skills, Ernuszt was appointed royal treasurer in 1467, elevated to the nobility and awarded by Matthias with the castle lordship of Csáktornya. Evidently continuing in business (it was difficult for any royal treasurer not to do so), Ernuszt acquired considerable mining interests in Besztercebánya. His son, Sigismund, was elevated to the bishopric of Pécs in 1473, which was always closely linked to the treasurer's office, and he succeeded to his father's office in 1493, while still maintaining the family's mining interests. In 1496, however, Sigismund was accused of embezzlement. In order to forestall the same sentence of imprisonment as had befallen his deputy, Sigismund bought his freedom for the incredible sum of 400,000 florins.²⁷ Had it not been, however, for this windfall, we may guess that little or none of the Ernuszt family's wealth would have otherwise made its way to the royal treasury.²⁸

Beyond the nobility and the kingdom's commercial elite, there was the church. By the early sixteenth century, the church owned about fifteen per cent of properties in the realm and about a fifth of Hungary's market towns. The income of the bishops and prelates of the realm (excluding Croatia) is reckoned to have been about 200,000 florins per year.²⁹ Certainly, a part of this, tithe income, might be effectively converted into a royal resource by specifying that it be used to furnish military contingents. According to the law of 1498, the principal churchmen of the realm were thus obliged to field retainers, amounting in all to 6,600 cavalrymen, and the lesser clergy to contribute to furnishing the local county contingents.³⁰ The weakness of the clerical estate at the diets meant, moreover, that its members might be subjected to additional imposts.³¹ Nevertheless, the resources of the church remained for most of this period largely outside the treasury's reach. Individual churchmen, such as the cardinal primate Bakócz, might thus accumulate substantial private wealth, sufficient to found their own dynasties. In Bakócz's case, however, the king confiscated upon his death in 1521 his entire moveable wealth, which amounted to at least 40,000 florins (he was unable to get

²⁶ Ernuszt maintained close links with Buda's Jewish community throughout his life; his coat-of-arms bore a double Star of David. See G. Komoróczy, ed. *Jewish Budapest*, Budapest 1999, 13.

²⁷ F. Soós, *Magyarország kincstartói 1340-1540*. Budapest 1999, 43-44, 50-51.

²⁸ Ernuszt had, in fact, embezzled 10,000 florins, through an easily-spotted accounting fraud.

²⁹ A. Kubinyi, *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon*. [Prelates, ecclesiastical institutions and faith in medieval Hungary] Budapest 1999, 88. This figure roughly comports with our earlier estimate of total noble income being about a million florins per year.

³⁰ 1498: 15.

³¹ 1518 (Bács): 18. See also 1495: 31.

hold of his landed assets).³² The royal right to sequester the entire property of prelates who had recently died in office was subsequently approved by the diet.³³ Thus although Bakócz's successor as primate, George Szatmári, left upon his death 60,000 florins of his personal fortune to the king, Louis seized the whole of his moveables.³⁴ The private wealth of Bakócz and Szatmári may have been rather less than Sigismund Ernuszt's. Nevertheless, their example indicates the extent to which the treasury was failing to exploit the accrued wealth of the church, leaving this instead to the prelates to sweep up.

Fiscal Decentralization

The adage, "rich land, poor country," was never appropriate for Hungary. The country was rich; it was the kingdom's government that was poor. Under the Jagello rulers, however, a system of decentralized revenue collection was put in place that broke with the methods previously used by Matthias, whereby taxes were paid directly into the treasury and expended on the recruitment of a largely mercenary (and foreign) royal army. It is not clear how the fiscal arrangements practiced after 1490 worked in all their details. The texts of the laws relating to royal finance are often ambiguous and they do not always comport with the surviving charter material. Some guidance is, however, provided by the survival of a volume of treasury records for 1494-1495, compiled as part of the evidence laid against Sigismund Ernuszt.³⁵ This tells us that treasury expenditure was 200,000 florins, but that actual income was 180,000 florins, leaving a 20,000 florin deficit. Income should, however, have been about a 100,000 florins more, but there was significant non-payment to the treasury of a part of the one-florin household tax raised on the peasantry.³⁶

If we examine these figures closely, however, several discrepancies become apparent. Most obviously, no tax income is recorded from twelve of the counties in the south-east of the kingdom. Instead, a single payment was made on their behalf of a token 5000 florins by the military captain, Paul Kinizsi, who bore responsibility at that time for the defense of the Lower Danube frontier.³⁷ Plainly, Kinizsi had himself collected the tax of the twelve counties, allocated it according to his own military needs, and handed over what remained to the treasury. Likewise, there are in the treasury accounts no references to income accruing from Slavonia – presumably, these too were retained at source. The figures given elsewhere in the treasury accounts in respect of non-payment of the household

³² V. Fraknói, *Erdődi Bakócz Tamás élete*. [Life of Thomas Bakócz of Erdőd] Budapest 1889, 176, 200; Hungarian National Archive, *Collectio Antemohacsiana*, DI.8805.

³³ 1525 (Hatvan): 17.

³⁴ P. Tóth-Szabó, *Szatmári György prímás (1427-1524)*. [Life of Primate György of Szatmár] Budapest 1906, 301-302.

³⁵ *Registrum omnium proventuum regalium*, published in J. Ch. von Engel, *Geschichte des ungrischen Reichs und seiner Nebenländer*, Vol. 1, Halle 1797, 17-181.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 181-182.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

tax are equally suggestive. Certainly, there were in every county petty nobles who because they owned no land of their own had become liable to taxation but who were, nonetheless, incapable of payment. The vast majority of the unpaid tax had, however, been assessed by officials on behalf of the treasury by reference to peasant households, but the relevant lords had not released the money. These lords included the principal barons of the realm, most notably the palatine, so we are hardly dealing here with the sequestration of royal revenues by unscrupulous robber lords living on the political or geographical margins of the kingdom.

The income which local lords were diverting in 1494–1495 was the so-called *subsidium* of a florin. This was an extraordinary tax, normally voted by the diet (although in some years the diet was bypassed and the tax approved by the royal council alone), that was raised on peasant households. From no later than 1493, however, the leading men of the realm were permitted to collect this tax themselves and use it to recruit troops for their own retinues, and this arrangement prevailed for most of the Jagello period.³⁸ These private armies or *banderia* were supposed to operate at a fixed size, but the figure was adjusted to the resources available.³⁹ Barons fielding armies on the frontier and those required to maintain standing forces had their income supplemented with direct grants from the royal treasury.⁴⁰ Likewise, the major prelates were expected to retain *banderia*, furnished out of the revenue of their tithe income, and to deploy these on the border.⁴¹

Ordinary nobles who did not have their own *banderia* or standing forces were expected to enforce collection of the *subsidium* from their tenant peasants. A part of the money they raised was paid to the treasury, which used the proceeds to sustain the border defenses and to subsidize the main baronial *banderia*.⁴² The remainder, about a half of the total that was collected, was not, however, paid to the treasury but to the county. These *pecuniae exercitiales* (*pecuniae ad exercituandum*), as they were known, were used to recruit mercenaries, mainly heavy cavalymen, although lightly-armed hussars were increasingly demanded, especially in the south, as they were better at dealing with Turkish raiders, while in the northern counties harquebusiers were required.⁴³ As far as we can make out, these mercenaries were local men, possibly landless peasants or drovers who followed a military vocation for part of the year. The names of the mercenaries' captains, where they are preserved, certainly suggest a Hungarian origin.⁴⁴

³⁸ J. Házi, *Sopron szabad királyi város története. Oklevéltár*. [History of the Royal Free City of Sopron. Documents] 2 vols. Sopron 1921–1933, Vol. 1, part 6: 123; 1518 (Tolna): 17.

³⁹ Házi, *Sopron, ibid.*, 122; 1492: 20; 1518 (Bács): 1.

⁴⁰ These are listed in 1498: 21.

⁴¹ 1498: 15; 1521: 15.

⁴² Kubinyi, "The Battle of Szávaszentdemeter-Nagyolaszi (1523)," 76; ed. E. Liptai, *Magyarország hadtörténete*. [Military history of Hungary] 2 vols, Budapest 1984, 1, 141.

⁴³ 1498: 16; 1523: 19.

⁴⁴ K. Kandra, "Bakócz-codex," in *idem*, *Adatok az egri egyházmegye történelméhez*. Vol. 1, Eger 1885, 350–351, 402–403; A. Kubinyi, "The Road to Defeat: Hungarian Politics and Defense in the Jagiellonian Period," in J. M. Bak, B. K. Király, *From Hunyadi to Rákóczi*:

The number of troops that any individual county was supposed to furnish rested on a ratio determined by the number of peasantry. The ratio varied from one warrior per 36 households, to one per twenty and even one per ten.⁴⁵ When the number of troops needed or their period of service increased, the *subsidium* also went up, after 1518 from one to two florins per peasant household. The principle of the ratio went back to *militia portalis* introduced during the reign of Sigismund by the terms of which the peasants themselves had been obliged to furnish set numbers of warriors from out of their ranks. Although this form of military recruitment had long been abandoned, the *pecuniae exercitiales* were understood as payments made in lieu of military service.⁴⁶ In time of emergency, however, some or all peasants might yet be expected to join local units.⁴⁷

The fiscal methods of the Jagello rulers involved the decentralization to the barons and the counties of revenue collection and its disbursement locally on military recruitment. This sort of arrangement required, however, a high degree of trust, which was in short supply in Jagello Hungary. The common nobles who gathered at the diet or sent delegates there, were convinced that the lords and larger landowners were not in fact collecting taxes from their peasants to field armies but were purloining the money instead for their own ends. This was true to the extent that the lords collected the *subsidium* every year from their tenants but were seldom obliged to raise their *banderia* for service in war, deploying such troops as they raised for private purposes. Accordingly, in 1511 the diet succeeded in securing the appointment of an "estates treasurer," elected by itself, who in company with one of the barons, was supposed to supervise the collection and administration of the tax voted that year.⁴⁸ The institution soon languished and after 1516 the royal council assumed control of the treasury apparatus.⁴⁹ Clearly though, the common nobility remained convinced that money was being diverted to personal ends. At the Tolna diet of 1518, the diet sought to have representatives of the counties supervise the collection of taxes, after which they were held to report to the diet.⁵⁰ Later that year, an even more ambitious scheme was pro-

War and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Hungary, New York 1982, 168. See also 1521: 16.

⁴⁵ 1492: 20; 1498: 16; 1518 (Tolna): 2; 1523: 19.

⁴⁶ C. Wagner, *Petri de Warda Epistolae*, Pressburg-Kassa 1776, 218. Here *praediales* of the Archbishop of Kalocsa who should have served with the contingent of Solt county were held liable to *pecuniae exercitiales*, but they claimed poverty (1491); A. Kubinyi, *Matthias Rex*. Budapest 2008, 118. See also 1526: 28.

⁴⁷ E. Mályusz, "II. Lajos király levelei a Herceg Batthyány-család körmendi leveltárában (1526)," [Letters of King Louis II in the Prince Batthyány Family Archive in Körmend] *Levélári Közlemények* 4 (1927), 81, 87, 89–90; A. Fekete Nagy, et al., *Monumenta Rusticorum in Hungaria Rebellium Anno MDXIV*, Budapest 1979, 105; 1523: 19; 1526: 10.

⁴⁸ Gy. Bónis, "Ständisches Finanzwesen in Ungarn im frühen 16. Jahrhundert," in *Nouvelles Études historiques*. 2 vols, Budapest 1965, 1: 87–89.

⁴⁹ D. Szabó, *A magyar országgyűlések története II. Lajos korában*. [History of the Hungarian diets in the reign of Louis II] Budapest 1909, 22.

⁵⁰ 1518 (Tolna): 9–12.

posed whereby the diet would, as in 1511, appoint its own estates treasurers who would arrange for the collection of taxes, see to the recruitment of mercenary forces, and ensure that the barons fielded *banderia* appropriate to the revenues that they raised. The system of supervision inaugurated at the Bács diet of 1518 scarcely lasted much more than a year.⁵¹ Nevertheless, in 1521 an even more radical remedy was attempted by the diet. All payments of tax were henceforth to go through estates treasurers appointed by the diet and the previous arrangement whereby barons and larger landowners funded their contingents by diverting revenues was abolished. From now on, their *banderia* and retinues were to be paid for out of central funds. The aim behind this was both to prevent defalcation and to equip a larger mercenary force.⁵² As it turned out, however, the scheme imposed in 1521 was far too ambitious as well as too cumbersome and inflexible. Money continued to be diverted at source in order to fund military recruitment and thus never made its way to the treasury.⁵³ On the ground, many of the collectors were inexperienced and selected on account of their connections rather than their expertise. In the end, less than a paltry 100,000 florins reached the treasury. The arrangement was abandoned and previous methods of military financing re-introduced, with the barons, larger landowners and counties once again equipping their forces out of tax revenue taken at source.⁵⁴

The financial reform of 1521 was accompanied by two further innovations. First, the treasury undertook a reform of the coinage, replacing its silver denar currency with heavily debased coin, an expedient from which, it was anticipated, "a great sum of money could be added to [the king's] revenues."⁵⁵ As it turned out, the reform resulted in immediate inflation and yielded only a one-off dividend of about 120,000 florins.⁵⁶ Secondly, the principle of the nobility's exemption from taxation was for the first time called into question. In a remarkable act, the diet meeting in 1521 imposed a fifty per cent levy on the major sources of noble income, "notwithstanding the privilege of their liberty."⁵⁷ It is uncertain whether this extreme measure was applied in the years immediately following and Louis promised that it would not be.⁵⁸ In 1525, however, a record of all noble incomes, including revenue streams that had been left out of the law of 1521, was required by the diet with a view to establishing the military obligations of the individual counties of the realm.⁵⁹ A few months later, local captains were given the right to assess noble incomes on the spot and take what they needed to fit out troops.⁶⁰ Although this last measure was set aside as the diet that had agreed it

⁵¹ Bónis, "Ständisches Finanzwesen," 92.

⁵² Kubinyi, "The Battle of Szávaszentdemeter-Nagyolaszi," 81-82.

⁵³ Szabó, *A magyar országgyűlések története*, 177

⁵⁴ Bónis, "Ständisches Finanzwesen," 94-100.

⁵⁵ 1521: 6, 14; 1526: 36.

⁵⁶ A. Kubinyi, "Magyarország hatalmasai és a török veszély," 239.

⁵⁷ 1521: 17.

⁵⁸ 1521: 21.

⁵⁹ 1525 (Rákos): 9.

⁶⁰ 1525 (Hatvan): 10.

was deemed illegal, the assembly that convened the next year approved the principle of taxes being raised according to the capacity of individual nobles.⁶¹ It may well be that the taxes on noble income and wealth were never actually imposed or, if they were, never collected in full (the English lay subsidies seldom yielded more than a small fraction of what they should have done).⁶² Nevertheless, the implication in the laws was clear: henceforth nobles should regard their revenues as being, at least *in extremis*, a taxable resource.

The arrangements briefly adopted in 1521 – removal of the nobility's exemption, debasement of the coinage and the attempt to have all taxes go through the treasury – should not distract us from the principle of fiscal decentralization that prevailed throughout most of the Jagello period. According to this principle, a part of the kingdom's military capacity was funded at a local level, with royal revenues being taken at source to equip the *banderia* of the barons and to provide for the upkeep of the local contingents maintained by the counties. What passed to the king was used to fund the border garrisons and the few *banderia* that were sustained directly by the royal treasury. These forces were supplemented with retinues provided by the church out of its tithe income. It is for this reason that the treasury receipts look so low, since much of what was actually feeding into the kingdom's military capacity never actually went through the treasury. Its income of 200,000 florins listed in the 1494–1495 treasury records thus represents only a portion of the wealth that the treasury mobilized. If we consider the money taken at source by the barons, larger landowners and counties, and add in the tithe income used to furnish the prelates' own retinues along with the money accruing through ordinary revenues (salt, customs and so on), then we may reckon on an imputed income in the early sixteenth century of around 600,000 florins per year, plus windfalls, forced loans and so on. Although this sum was still small in comparison to the sums raised in contemporary France or Spain, it was about the same amount as Matthias obtained from domestic sources during the last decades of his reign.

Away from the Fiscal-Military State

Despite the misgivings of the diet, the decentralized fiscal arrangements practiced under Hungary's Jagello rulers proved sufficient to field an army of impressive size and composition. As it happened, the army deployed at Mohacs was no match for the Sultan who, being aware of the kingdom's military strength, had taken care to raise against it a double army that was made up of both his Anatolian and Rumelian (that is Balkan) forces. The fiscal-military organization of the realm not only, however, resulted in the provision of an army capable of taking on the Turks, albeit unsuccessfully, but also hastened political decentralization within the kingdom, thereby reinforcing existing relations of power.

⁶¹ 1526: 11.

⁶² M. Jurkowski, C. L. Smith, D. Crook, *Lay Taxes in England and Wales 1188–1688*. Kew 1988, 130–133.

The relationship between war and the development of polities has by now become generally accepted. We are told that from the late Middle Ages onwards (the date is unclear), the burden of military provision obliged governments to shift from domain-based to tax-based systems of revenue raising. Along with this, came the bureaucratic and professional organization of government, increased governmental reach over available resources, larger administrative and financial centralization, and by degrees a greater apprehension among those called upon to shoulder the burden of taxation that they belonged to a political, even national community. By this measure, the fiscal imperatives engendered by warfare led to the foundation of the modern state. In reviewing these developments in the later Middle Ages, Jean-Philippe Genet has remarked, "The costs of war were enormous and rising [...]. Spurred on by the vital necessity to generate an ever-increasing amount of capital, [...] the growing "modern states" of western Europe had developed a means of raising money which guaranteed more abundant revenues than before [...]. As the revenues of these societies increased, so they functioned more effectively as states."⁶³

There are plenty of criticisms of the fiscal-military model of state development, not least its teleology, the many exceptions to its rules (most signally the case of Prussia, the revenues of which long remained significantly domain-based), and its emphasis upon the coercive nature of government. As Charles Tilly reminds us, besides forcing the costs of war from their subjects, rulers might also pursue other routes, negotiating with existing power-holders and having them use their local muscle to extract the cash that the rulers themselves needed. In return, rulers might be induced to concede new rights to these power-holders, thus reinforcing their privileges and power. As Tilly observes, "[...] bargaining over the state's extractive claims produced rights, privileges and protective institutions that had not previously existed."⁶⁴ As a consequence, the fiscal demands of government brought about by war might not have the transforming, modernizing influence that may be observed in some parts of Western Europe, but serve instead through bargaining to entrench existing relations of power, even at the expense of the centre's own authority. At its most extreme, this phenomenon may be discerned in parts of the Ottoman Empire after around 1600, when substantial tax-raising and military responsibilities were vested by the Sultan in local pashas and potentates, who thereafter exercised an almost independent power in their provinces. Such also occurred, however, in late-seventeenth and eighteenth-century England, which is often otherwise regarded as one of Europe's premier fiscal-military states. As O'Brien and Hunt have argued in relation to England after 1688, "The level, structure and mode of government deployed for direct taxa-

⁶³ J.-Ph. Genet, "Politics: Theory and Practice," in Ch. Allmand, *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 7, (c. 1415–c. 1500), Cambridge 1998, 6–7.

⁶⁴ Ch. Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990–1990*. Oxford 1990, 103. Tilly's analysis is obviously indebted to Barrington Moore's *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Boston 1966.

tion reflected compromises between court and country, centre and locality, monarchy and aristocracy over the division of political power within the realm."⁶⁵

The same set of considerations surely also apply to the last decades of medieval Hungary.⁶⁶ The decentralized system of tax collection and military recruitment employed by the Jagello kings had the consequence of entrenching the powers of the principal power holders and institutions in the realm, thereby diminishing the scope and persuasiveness of royal government. The counties thus had their autonomy and authority extended, and they accordingly became semi-autonomous corporations, vested not only with the authority to collect taxes and raise contingents for war but also with an extended jurisdictional competence that included the right to choose their own magistracies. It was, however, the great lords – those who collected the tax revenues due from their estates and converted this resource into their own private armies or *banderia* – that profited the most. After 1498, the leading men of the kingdom, the so-called “banderial lords,” were recognized as constituting a hereditary class of barons. Whereas previously the dignity of baron and thus automatic membership of the royal council had belonged to the king’s main office holders and so depended upon the royal right of nomination, from this point on a hereditary peerage was also acknowledged with rights identical to those of the kingdom’s “true barons.” These *barones naturales* or barons *ex natu* were chosen from among those families who by reason of their wealth had the physical resources to equip and field their own military contingents and have them muster under their own banner. Like the office-holding barons, the hereditary peers had the address of *magnificus*, received a personal royal summons to attend meetings of the diet and were entitled to seal documents with red wax. The establishment of a hereditary baronage, with full entitlement to sit on the royal council, presaged the emergence just a century later of the Upper House of the Hungarian diet. Together with the county gentry, it was this group of hereditary barons which would later prove the main obstacle to Habsburg bureaucratic centralization.

Conclusion

As Antonín Kalous’s work has demonstrated, the Hungarian army that fought the Turks in 1526 was both numerous and well equipped. It was sustained through a system of military recruitment and finance that rested not upon the centralization of functions, as was typical of fiscal-military states, but upon its very reverse. Fiscal decentralization was effective and probably resulted in an imputed, indirect yield to the treasury that was little different to that previously obtained in the fifteenth century, during the reign of Matthias. This decentralization, however, resulted in a consolidation of the powers of both the counties and the emerging class of hereditary peers. In this way, fiscal developments during

⁶⁵ P. O’Brien and Ph. A. Hunt, “England, 1685–1815,” in R. Bonney, *The Rise of the Fiscal State in Europe, c. 1200–1815*. Oxford 1999, 78.

⁶⁶ For this and what follows, see M. Rady, *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*. Basingstoke and New York 2000, 153–154, 170.

the Jagello period, although yielding an efficient army, served to entrench Hungary's existing structure of power relations, thus contributing to the kingdom's political complexity and to the weakness of its central authority.

Die linguistischen Lehren eines mittelalterlichen Rechnungsbuches

Das Rechnungsbuch Herzog Sigismunds

ZOLTÁN HOROGSZEGI – KRISZTINA RÁBAI



Das 16. Jahrhundert ist ein ungeheuer spannendes, veränderungsreiches Jahrhundert der Geschichte sowohl Ungarns als auch Europas. Im ersten Jahrzehnt dieses Jahrhunderts entstand jene unglaublich reiche Quelle, nämlich das Rechnungsbuch Sigismunds des Jagiellonen, welches in Anknüpfung an die Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte mehrerer Nationen und Länder viele bislang ungenutzte Möglichkeiten bietet. In der vorliegenden Studie wird zunächst Sigismunds Leben kurz vorgestellt – konzentriert vor allem auf seine Fürstenjahre. Im Anschluss daran wird auf die grundlegenden Kriterien des Rechnungsbuches als historisches Quellenmaterial eingegangen. Daran schließt eine Untersuchung der sprachlichen Merkmale der Quelle an. Schließlich wird eine Zusammenfassung der wesentlichen Ergebnisse vorgenommen.

Sigismund war Mitglied der Jagiellodynastie, der fünfte Sohn von Kasimir IV. König von Polen und Elisabeth von Habsburg. Er ist am 1. Januar 1467 in Koźnice geboren und am 1. April 1548 in Krakau gestorben.¹ Nach Kazimirs Tod im Jahre 1492 haben seine Söhne die väterlichen Herrschaftsgebiete untereinander verteilt. Ladislaus herrschte über das Königreich Ungarn und Böhmen, den polnischen Thron erbte Johann Albrecht, das Großfürstentum Litauen fiel Alexander zu. Friedrich trat eine geistliche Laufbahn an, er wurde Erzbischof von Gniezno. Nach dem Tode seines Vaters fiel Sigismund zu wenig Landgut zu, um sich ein standesgemäßes Leben zu sichern. Für seine Kosten musste er mit einem Anfall von 8000 *Florines* aufkommen, den ihm Johann Albrecht gewährte. Die Jagiellonen haben sich später so entschieden, dass Sigismund am Hof seines

¹ „Sigismundus igitur Kasimiri quintus filius & octava proles Anno salutis 1467 die prima Januarij natus...” L. Decius, *De vetustatibus Polonorum*. Cracoviae 1521, LVII.; „Sigismundus primus rex Polonie [...] vixit annis octaginta et uno, mensibus tribus. Regnavit annis quadraginta et uno, mensibus duobus, diebus septem. Mortuus est a Christo nazo anno 1548.” *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, Vol. 3. Warsawa 1961, 218–219; M. Duczmal, *Jagiellonowie: Leksykon biograficzny*. Krakow 1996, 542–561.

Bruders Ladislaus zu Ofen aufgenommen wird.² Der Herzog hat sich zwischen Dezember 1498 und Dezember 1501 in Ungarn aufgehalten, dann ist er nach Krakau gezogen. Später hat er Ungarn noch zweimal besucht, im September–November 1502 und im Juni–August 1505.³

Für die Verpflegung des Herzogs und seiner Hofhaltung in Buda hat Ladislaus Sorge getragen. Nicht nur das nötige Geld, sondern auch die Naturbedürfnisse hat er seinem Bruder zur Verfügung gestellt. Während die Naturbedürfnisse vom Verwalter des Königs (*dispensator*) dem Hof von Sigismund angewiesen wurden, kam das Geld der Kasse des Herzogs über die Kammergrafen Johann und Georg Thurzo zu. Auf die Fürsprache von Ladislaus hat Johann Albrecht im Jahre 1499 an Sigismund das Fürstentum Glogau verschenkt. Im Jahre 1501, nach dem Tode von Johann Albrecht hatte Sigismund die Möglichkeit, die polnische Krone zu erwerben, aber sein Wunsch blieb unerfüllt, da sein älterer Bruder, Alexander zum König von Polen gekrönt wurde. Von 1504 war er Verweser in Schlesien und ihm ist auch die Markgrafschaft Lausitz zugefallen. Durch seine Justiz- und Verwaltungsreformen entwickelten diese Gebiete zu Musterstaaten des zeitgenössischen Europas.⁴ Nach dem unerwarteten Tode Alexanders im Jahre 1506 hat Sigismund auch die polnische Krone bekommen, die er unter dem Namen Sigismund I. der Alte bis zu seinem Tode getragen hat.

Sigismund I. hat das Gebiet des polnischen Königiums erfolgreich vergrößert und ihm das Herzogtum Preußen, das ehemalige Gebiet des Deutschen Ordens und das Fürstentum Masowien angeschlossen. Mit seinem Namen ist die Verbreitung des Renaissancestils in Polen verbunden. Mit der ungarischen Herrschaft der Jagiellonen wurden die Beziehungen zwischen den beiden Ländern enger.⁵

Die Rechnungsbücher bilden eine wertvolle Gattung innerhalb der mittelalterlichen schriftlichen Quellen. In der Geschichtsforschung werden vor allem die Hofrechnungsbücher als Primärquellen angesehen. Ihre Sprache ist objektiv, ihre Texte beschränken sich auf das Wesentliche. Sie sind solche Quellen, die nicht nur dafür geeignet sind, die Leser mit dem Hofapparat und dessen Innen- und Alltagsleben bekannt zu machen, sondern auch ein Licht auf die Welt außerhalb des Hofes werfen. Es wurden jedoch nicht nur Rechnungsbücher von königlichen und herzoglichen Hofhaltungszeremonien für die Nachwelt überliefert. In West-

² J. Caro, *Geschichte Polens*. Vol. 5. Gotha 1888, 685–711; A. Divéky, *Az 1494. évi lőcsei fejedelmi kongresszus*. [Die Levotschaner Fürstenkongress im Jahr 1494.] Lőcse 1913; A. Divéky, „Újabb elmélet az 1494. évi lőcsei fejedelmi kongresszusról.” [Neue Theorie zum Levotschaner Fürstenkongress im Jahr 1494] *Századok* 54 (1919–1920), 371–379.

³ A. Divéky, ed. „Zsigmond lengyel herceg budai számadásai (1500–1502, 1505),” [Die Rechnungsbücher des polonischen Herzog Sigismund (1500–1502, 1505)] *Magyar Történelmi Tár* (1914), 163–211.

⁴ F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen: Das Beitalter Jagelloniden*. Vol. 5/2. Prag 1867, 25; C. Grünhagen, *Geschichte Schlesiens*, Vol. 1, Gotha 1884, 360–363; Divéky, *Zsigmond lengyel herceg*, 55; M. Dogiel, *Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Litvaniae*... Vol. 1. Vilnae 1758–1764, 25, 546–548.

⁵ P. Jasienica, *Jagiellonian Poland*. Übers. A. Jordan, Miami 1978, 1–346.

europa war es – im Laufe des Mittelalters, aber besonders von der Neuzeit an – üblich, dass auch kirchliche Institutionen und Angestellte, hochadelige Familien oder Städte ein Rechnungsbuch führen, in dem sie ihre Einnahmen und Ausgaben aufgezeichnet haben.⁶

Ungefähr ein Drittel des Rechnungsbuches von Sigismund wurde auf dem Gebiet des mittelalterlichen Ungarischen Königiums verfasst, und zwei Drittel auf den Gebieten des Königreichs Polen und des Großfürstentums Litauen. Das Quellenmaterial aus Ungarn ist im Hinblick auf die Rechnungsbücher aus der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts ziemlich gut. Neben den auf Ungarn bezüglichen Teilen der Rechnungen Sigismunds wurden je ein Teil der Rechnungsbücher von Ladislaus II. und Ludwig II. für die Nachwelt überliefert, andere *registra* werden nicht erwähnt.⁷

Was das Königreich Polen betrifft, wurde hier die Führung von Rechnungsbüchern von der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts verbreitet.⁸ In den Staatsarchiven von Warschau und Krakau werden zahlreiche solche Quellen aufbewahrt, ein Teil deren wurde in der kritischen Ausgabe bereits publiziert, aber der wesentliche Teil ist noch nicht veröffentlicht worden.⁹ In die Reihe dieser Rechnungsaufzeichnungen gehören auch die Rechnungen aus den Fürstenjahren Sigismunds des Jagiellonen in zwei Bänden.¹⁰

Es ist aus dem parallel mit dem Hauptbuch geführten *Registrum curiensium* bekannt,¹¹ dass Sigismund schon 1494 über eine eigene Hofhaltung verfügte, deren Erstgesetzter auch damals schon Krzysztof Szydłowiczki, der nachmalige Kanzler war.

Auf die Handschrift selbst und deren auf Ungarns Geschichte bezügliche Teile hat zuerst Adorján Divéky aufmerksam gemacht. Nach der Untersuchung des Textes hat er dessen in Ungarn geschriebene Teile umgeschrieben, ergänzt mit einigen im Ausland verfassten, aber ungarischbezogenen Aufzeichnungen. Die Umschrift von Divéky erschien im Jahre 1914 in den Spalten des *Magyar Történelmi Tár*

⁶ R. Sprandel, „Rechnungsbücher“, in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Vol. 7. Munich 1995, 508–510.

⁷ J. C. Engel, *Geschichte des ungarischen Reiches und seiner Nebenländer*. Vol. 1. Halle 1797, 17–181; V. Fraknoi, ed., „II. Lajos király számadási könyve. 1525. január 12–július 16.“ [Die Abrechnungsbücher Königs Ludovicus II. von 12. Juni bis 16. Juli 1525] *Magyar Történelmi Tár* (1877), 45–236.; J. C. Engel, *Monumenta Ungarica*. Vienna 1809, 187–236.

⁸ D. Antanavičius, R. Petrauskas, ed. and übers., *Lietuvos didžiojo kunigaikščio Aleksandro Jogailaičio dvaro sąskaitų knygos (1494–1504)*. [Die Abrechnungsbücher von Alexander Jagiellonen Grossfürst von Litauen (1494–1504)] Vilnius 2007, XXXVI.

⁹ T. Zieliński, *Archiwum Głównie Akt Dawnych: informator o zasobie*. Warszawa 1992.

¹⁰ Ms. Warsaw, Rachunki królewskie sygn. 29, 33, Archiwum Skrabu Koronnego I., Archiwum Głównie Akt Dawnych.

¹¹ *Regestrum curiensium domini principis Sigismundi aui Ad Equos Serviunt Et quot Aliquis Equos habet Et A quo tempore cuilibet Incipit Servitium Similiter Quum aliquis Accepit pecunias ad suum servitium Et in quo Loco Etc.* Ms. Warsaw, Rachunki królewskie sygn. 21. Archiwum Skrabu Koronnego I., Archiwum Głównie Akt Dawnych.

(*Ungarisches Historisches Archiv*).¹² Danach erschienen noch zahlreiche seiner wertvollen Studien in Zusammenhang mit der Quelle. Seine Textausgabe – die auch heutzutage von großer Bedeutung ist – und seine Studien haben seinen Namen sowohl im In- als auch im Ausland bekannt gemacht. Im Fachwerk von Adolf Pawiński,¹³ welches nicht zur Veröffentlichung bestimmt war und weitaus fragmentarischer als das von Divéky ist, sind ebenfalls zahlreiche Zeilen aus dem Rechnungsbuch zu lesen. Eine Veröffentlichung des ganzen Quellenwerkes erfolgte bis jetzt nicht.

Was die Handschrift betrifft, ist sie leserlich, Schwierigkeiten bedeuten nur die damalige „Rechtschreibung“ der polnischen Wörter, sowie einige Abkürzungen, die in vollkommener Form in der Schrift nie vorkommen. In Zusammenhang mit den Rechnungen als Ganzen ist schwierig zu entscheiden, von wie vielen Personen sie geschrieben wurden. Einerseits liegt das daran, dass die Anfangszeilen der verschiedenen Einheiten zweifelsohne schöner, ausführlicher geschrieben wurden, was nicht eindeutig die Zuziehung eines anderen Schreibers bedeutet. Andererseits liegt das an der Entstehung der Quelle. Da die Ausgaben ad hoc aufgezeichnet wurden, waren die Bedingungen für die Kalligraphie wohl nicht immer gegeben, es konnte durchaus vorkommen, dass der Schreiber unterwegs oder unter ungeeigneten Umständen arbeiten musste. Eine andere Handschrift ist jedoch eindeutig zu unterscheiden. Diese Handschrift erscheint in beiden Bänden der Rechnungen. Obwohl das Rechnungsbuch grundsätzlich in chronologischer Reihenfolge geschrieben ist, gibt es in dem Werk oft nachträgliche Eintragungen, der Schreiber konnte ja nicht überall da sein, wo die Beschaffungen und Ausgaben des Fürstenhofes verrichtet wurden.

Zwischen den Zeilen erscheint in bestimmten Abständen auch eine dritte Handschrift, die Handschrift von Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, der die Überprüfung der Richtigkeit der Rechnungsbucheintragungen immer zu Papier gebracht und mit seiner Unterschrift auch bezeugt hat.

Der Rezipient stößt bei der Verarbeitung des Textes auf einige Schwierigkeiten. Da es in unserem Fall nicht um ein philosophisches Werk, eine Chronik oder eine in feierlicher Form ausgestellte Urkunde geht, die für die Nachwelt geschaffen wurden, sondern um eine für die praktische Anwendung bestimmte Buchführung, kann natürlich weder ein höherer Sprachverbrauch noch eine Schönschrift von der Quelle erwartet werden. Ihre Sätze sind grundsätzlich einfach gebaut und leicht zu verstehen. Oft handelt es sich um ziemlich lakonische, stark reduzierte, eilig geschriebene Eintragungen, deren Verständnis für die zeitgenössischen Leser vermutlich keine Schwierigkeiten bereitete. Sie waren ja durch den gemeinsamen sprachlichen Kode mit der genauen Bedeutung im Klaren, dem Gegenwartsverbraucher jedoch bietet auch der weitere Kontext keine Möglichkeit, den Text genauer zu verstehen. Natürlich gibt es auch längere, die Sprach-

¹² Divéky, „Zsigmond lengyel herceg budai számadásai,” A. Divéky, ed. „Zsigmond lengyel herceg budai számadásai (1500–1502, 1505),” [Die Rechnungsbücher des polnischen Herzog Sigismund (1500–1502, 1505)] Magyar Történelmi Társ (1914).

¹³ A. Pawiński, *Młode lata Zygmunt Starego*. Warszawa 1893.

struktur betrachtet kompliziertere Eintragungen, die Daten zur Geldwechslung beinhalten, und in Zusammenhang mit der Begründung der Einnahme und Ausgabe mehrerer, verschiedener Summen entstanden sind.

Da die Muttersprache der Verfasser Polnisch ist, kann die polnische Sprache an zahlreichen Stellen als Basis des sprachlichen Denkens angesehen werden. Oft kommen solche Sätze vor, die wahrscheinlich in polnischer Wortfolge, aber mit lateinischen Wörtern geschrieben wurden. Darüber hinaus wurden zahlreiche polnische Ausdrücke, in manchen Fällen auch ganze Sätze aufgezeichnet. Die Verwendung von polnischen Wörtern ist besonders charakteristisch, wenn innerhalb der Bedeutung eines lateinischen Wortes zwischen mehreren leicht unterschiedlichen Bedeutungsgehalten zu unterscheiden sind. Ein typisches Beispiel dafür stellt die Gruppe der Pferde dar, wo die Bedeutung des Wortes „*equus*“ mit einem hingeschriebenen polnischen Ausdruck präzisiert wird.¹⁴

Auch die Übersetzung der rein lateinischen Textstellen kann manchmal problematisch sein, die Verfasser gebrauchen nämlich eine ziemlich nachlässige Sprache. Es kommt vor, dass der Schreiber Wörter weglässt, ein anderes Mal schreibt er ein Prädikat oder einen Ausdruck zweimal in den Satz, aber all das geht nicht auf die Kosten des Verstehens. Oft werden Wörter, sogar das Prädikat ausgelassen oder falsch konjugiert. Es kommt auch die Verwechslung von Aktiv- und Passivformen vor.

Bei der Beschreibung von abgeschlossenen Verhältnissen (*praes. perf. ind. act./pass.*) dritte Person Singular oder Plural verwendet der Schreiber durative Prädikate in der Vergangenheitsform (*praet. imp. ind. act./pass.*). Aus dem Texttyp ergibt sich die häufige Verwendung des Passivs, zum Beispiel am Anfang von Eintragungen, wo der Lieferant, der Absender und natürlich der Betrag angegeben sind, werden mit Vorliebe passive Verbformen gebraucht.¹⁵

In Bezug auf die *declinatio* ist festzustellen, dass die Personennamen nur dann dekliniert werden, wenn der Name – hier ist wohl der Vorname gemeint – im Satz in lateinischer Form vorkommt. Personennamen sowie Ortsnamen kommen in diversen Formen vor, eine einheitliche Orthographie ist auch in dieser Hinsicht nicht charakteristisch, da war wahrscheinlich die Lautform, bzw. deren Niederschrift determinativ. Die Ortsnamen werden außer der lateinischen Formen („*Cracovia*“, „*Opavia*“, „*Glogovia*“) meistens nicht dekliniert. Ausnahme bilden dabei diejenigen, die eine lateinische Endung und einen lateinischen Klang haben. Eine interessante Erscheinung im Text ist die stellenweise Deklination des Wortes *centum*.

Aus der Eigenart der Quelle folgt, dass es im Text besonders viele Final- und Kausalkonstruktionen gibt. Sie werden meistens mit *ad* + *Gerundivum*,¹⁶ aber auch

¹⁴ Divéky, „Zsigmond lengyel herczeg budai számadásai,” 26, 46, 55, 89, 201.

¹⁵ „Item feria quarta in die Sancte Marie Magdalene [22. Juli 1506] portati sunt, a domina ducissa Mazowie, per dominum Raphaelem de Leszno duodecim centa et quadraginta septem floreni Hungaricales in auro.” Ms. 33. fol. 220v.

¹⁶ „Item feria v-ta in illa syllaba uni sep ha bet [5. Sept.] in progressu versus Lithvaniam, ad visitandum dominum regem Alexandrum, primo ista summa composita ex floreno Hungaricali

mit *ut + coniunctivus* zurückgegeben.¹⁷ Daneben werden sie auch mit *pro + Ablativus* und *propter + Gerundivum* Finalsätze ausgedrückt, obwohl diese nicht so oft vorkommen.¹⁸

Die *praepositiones* kommen im Text in großer Zahl vor. Vor allem die Präpositionen '*ad*' und '*pro*', die den Schreiber zur Vermeidung der unmittelbaren Wiederholung alternativ gebraucht hat.¹⁹ Auch vor den polnischen Wörtern steht manchmal eine lateinische *praepositio*, aber bei den polnischen Wörtern kommen öfter polnische Präpositionen („*na*“, „*ku*“) vor, die manchmal auch vor lateinischen Wörtern stehen.²⁰ Die Präposition *in* wird häufig verwendet. In *temporalem* Sinne ist der Kasusgebrauch richtig und konsequent, aber in *lokalem* Sinne sind Inkonssequenzen zu beobachten.²¹

Der Schreiber verwendete oft Abkürzungen, so schreibt er die Währungen und ihre Attribute fast nie aus.

Wegen der bedrängten finanziellen Lage des Herzogs sind die Rechnungen sehr ausführlich und präzise, deswegen malen sie ein ziemlich buntes Bild über das zeitgenössische Leben des Fürstenhofs. Während man sie studiert, kann man darüber ein Bild bekommen, wie die Hofhaltung funktioniert hat, aus wie vielen Personen sie bestand, wer welche Aufgaben hatte, und wer wie viel Geld verdient hat. Ganz unmittelbar kann man studieren, wie das Alltagsleben in einer der größten europäischen Dynastien war. Vor dem Leser entfalten sich der Tagesablauf des Herzogs, seine Hobbys, seine Lieblingsgegenstände, seine Garderobe, die Einrichtung seines Zimmers. Die Quelle liefert aber auch über das Alltagsleben von Menschen niedriger Schichten ein reiches Material.

Auch die medizinhistorischen Bezüge des Buches sind von Interesse. Es kommen oft Beträge vor, die zur Heilung einer Krankheit, einer Verletzung ausgegeben wurden, oder Almosen, die Elenden und Franzosenkranken gegeben wurden. Oft wird das Bad erwähnt, wo eine Art Gesunderhaltung und daneben auch eine Heiltätigkeit unter Mitwirkung von Barbieren betrieben wurde. Auch der Herzog selbst verfügte über einen sog. doppelten astrologischen Kalender, in dem wahrscheinlich auch gesundheitliche Anordnungen zu finden waren.

in auro, et ex moneta Polonicali incepta est extradi." Ms. 33. fol. 221r. „*Item Lypczyz ad principium equitanti versus Ruthnyki ad ordinanda hospitium dedi vi grossos.*" Ms. 33. fol. 222r.

¹⁷ „*Item feria iii-a in vigilia Simonis et Jude [27. Okt.] dedi Olbricht dispensatori, ut provideret digerita celarii, quum per dispensatores, qui prius dabant, non erat data, ut in suo stat registro v florenos.*" Ms. 33. fol. 229r.

¹⁸ „*Item pro sepo aurigis, ad picem pro ungendis axibus curruum, dedi iii grossos.*" Ms. 33. fol. 221v. „*Item Zaporski ad Wylnam, ad principium equitanti propter ordinanda hospitium, dedi xii grossos.*" Ms. 33. fol. 222r.

¹⁹ „*Item feria vi-a [11. Sept.] dispensatori, ad parva necessaria coquine dedi, ut in suo stat registro iii florenos. Item pro ii libris papiri ad thesaurum dedi iiii grossos.*" Ms. 33. fol. 222v.

²⁰ „*Item orosom ad clavos dedi na zabyyanye 1 ½ grossum.*" Ms. 33. fol. 228v. „*Item pro cordis ad viam na postronki ad currus dedi vi grossos.*" Ms. 33. fols. 53r.

²¹ „*Item sabbato in illa syllaba ve Cris pi nis si monis quin [24. Okt.] dedi a labore lucernarum vi in apoteka, et a labore candelarum pro mensa, et altari dedi, et a rubratione earum de uno lapide cere, per manus Olbricht dispensatoris dedi 1 florenum et xvii grossos.*" Ms. 33. fols. 228v.

Der Quelle sind auch zahlreiche Angaben in Bezug auf die Ernährung zu entnehmen. Ein interessantes Element des Hofes, nämlich die Persönlichkeit des Narren kann auf Schritt und Tritt über das bloße Angaben liefernde, sachliche Bild wahrgenommen werden, mit dem kränklichen Kaplan und dem Hund des Herzogs machen sie das höfische Leben lebensnäher und greifbarer.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich Folgendes feststellen: Beim Lesen des Rechnungsbuches wird deutlich, was für eine reiche Quelle es für jemanden ist, der sich für die mittelalterliche Kulturgeschichte und Alltagsleben interessiert. Mit der Übersicht der Rechnungen als Ganzen kann man sich einen Einblick in das Alltagsleben auf den Herrschaftsgebieten der Habsburger und Jagiellonen verschaffen, die im zeitgenössischen Mitteleuropa zu den führenden Mächten zählten. Durch die Veröffentlichung der Handschrift als Ganzes kann die Quelle für alle Interessenten erreicht werden und dadurch auf mehreren Gebieten der Geschichts- und Sprachwissenschaft Verwendung finden.

Character and Appearance of Ruthenian and Wallachian Settlement in Eastern Slovakia in the Middle Ages

VLADIMÍR RÁBIK



As being best known the ethnic group called "*Rutheni*" in contemporary sources played an important role in the ethnic, socio-legal and religious structure of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. In the territory of Slovakia it was mainly in the east that many districts acquired a special ethnic and religious character as a result of the Ruthenian penetration, and they have kept it until today. Above all, it is necessary to state that in relation to the local Slovak population, the Ruthenians differed in two very basic ways: ethnic origin and membership of the Eastern Christian rite. It was only later, in the course of the fourteenth and especially the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, that the Ruthenians came to be characterized by a specific socio-legal position, originally held by people of Rumanian nationality in the Kingdom of Hungary. However, the Rumanian ethnic group had a very minimal involvement in settlement of the territory of Slovakia, and the Ruthenians became the main bearers of Wallachian law in our territory. They had adopted this socio-legal system very early in their original homes in Galicia and present-day Trans-Carpathian Ukraine.¹ The Ruthenians in our territory shifted the originally ethnic meaning of the word *valachus* towards a socio-legal classification. However, the actual principles of Wallachian law underwent a special development in the territory of Slovakia and were strongly influenced by the older Ger-

¹ B. Varsík, *Osídlenie Košickej kotliny III*. [Settlement of the Košice Basin] Bratislava 1977, 371-384. P. Ratkoš, "Problematika kolonizácie na valašskom práve na území Slovenska," [The problem of colonization according to Wallachian Law in the territory of Slovakia] *Historické štúdie* 24 (1980), 181-222. J. Žudel, "Vývoj osídlenia Slovenska od počiatkov valašskej kolonizácie do konca stredoveku," [The development of settlement in Slovakia from the beginning of the Wallachian colonization to the end of the Middle Ages] *Archaeologia historica* 13 (1988), 7-15. J. Beňko, "Doosídľovania južných [slovenských] karpatských svahov valachmi a ich etnicita," [The settlement of the southern (Slovak) slopes of the Carpathians by Wallachians and their ethnicity] in *Pogranicze etniczne polsko-rusko-słowackie w średniowieczu*, ed. S. Czopek, Rzeszów 1996, 279-289. F. Uličný, "Začiatky Rusínov na Slovensku," [The beginnings of the Ruthenians in Slovakia] in *Pogranicze etniczne polsko*, 229-232.

man law,² according to which dozens of communities were established in eastern Slovakia. This was most significantly expressed in the names of some of the organizational units of the Wallachians, especially where there was an equivalent in German law. For example, the original name *kenez* for the hereditary mayor of a Wallachian village soon faded away, although it survived as a personal name. Already in the Middle Ages it was replaced by the term *scultetus* borrowed from German law. However, as we will see, this also had its settlement justification, because it is no accident that the settlement area of the Wallachian population in eastern Slovakia initially coincided to a large extent with the territory settled earlier according to German law. Wallachian settlement took advantage of the decline of German settlement in the fifteenth century and only later expanded into new settlements in new areas.

It is necessary to emphasize at the beginning that the non-autochthonous origin of the Ruthenian inhabitants of eastern Slovakia was already described reliably and in detail in the existing literature. Evidence of it is already found in the oldest Hungarian chronicles, which describe eastern Slovakia as the frontier district with Poland and *Ruthenia*,³ which is already not only a territorial, but also an ethnic definition, as can also be seen in fourteenth-century documents. For example, the territory of the Lordship of Makovica in north-eastern Šariš is still mentioned in 1367 as lying "*in confinibus Rutenicalibus, ubi pridem... lustra et saltus existerant*" and the population penetrating from that region is described as new and following a "pagan rite."⁴ Place name evidence is even more reliable. It points to the increased concentration of ethnic names of the type "Ruská Ves" (Russian Village) in eastern Slovakia, mostly dated before the thirteenth century. Such evidence is reliable because such names could only arise in a region where another linguistic and ethnic group, in this case the Slovaks, prevailed. Settlements are recorded of the Russian Varjags (so called in Slavic language) doing guard service for the Hungarian monarchs in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This was the origin of the surviving village names of Ruská, Ruskov, Veľký and Malý Rus-

² Karel Kadlec already pointed to this in *Valaši a valašské právo*. [The Wallachians and Wallachian Law] Praha 1916, 261 et passim.

³ *Anonymi Belae regis Hungariae notarii Hungarorum*. Cap. 8, 11, 12; in *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungariae*. Vol. 1, ed. A. F. Gombos, Budapestini 1937, 233–236. *Chronicon Hungarico-Polonicum*, ed. J. Deér, in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum* (henceforth SRH) Vol. 2, ed. E. Szentpétery, Budapestini 1938, 310–311. Most recently compare: F. Uličný, "Podiel Rusov, Rusínov na doosídľovaní Slovenska v stredoveku," [The share of the Russians or Ruthenians in the settlement of Slovakia in the Middle Ages] *Slavica Slovaca* 28:1–2 (1993), 21–27. M. Homza, "K vzniku stredovekej hranice Uhorska a Spiša a k historiografii vzťahov Spiša a Malopoľska," [On the origin of the medieval frontier of Hungary and Spiš and on the historiography of relations between Spiš and Little Poland] *Historický zborník* 8 (1998), 13–14.

⁴ Magyar Őrszágos Levéltár, Budapest, Diplomatikai Levéltár (henceforth DL.) 24482: "*propter... gentis novelle ritum paganisimum... de tenutis castri eorundem Makouycha vocati et possessionis Kuryma nuncupate in confinibus Rutenicalibus, ubi pridem... lustra et saltus existerant.*"

kov, established in the Slovak linguistic environment, and of the present village of Göncruszka in Hungary. In areas with continuous ethnic Hungarian or Magyar settlement in the tenth–twelfth centuries, village names such as Oroszi appeared.⁵ However, our study will not devote attention to such villages, but to more detailed consideration of the Ruthenian inhabitants, who penetrated into the territory of eastern Slovakia in large numbers only from the beginning of the fourteenth century, and whose settlement already had a different character and legal basis. The territory of the County of Užhorod, where the properties of the lords of Michalovce were concentrated, was the natural starting point for the penetration of Ruthenians into eastern Slovakia, so it is not surprising that we find the oldest evidence of this ethnic group precisely here, although the Ruthenians settled in the central part of Šariš at almost the same time. The initial penetration of the Ruthenians into the territory of the County of Užhorod was a result of the remarkable land improvement activities and extensive reorganization of the lands of the lords of Michalovce. Its moving force starting about the beginning of the fourteenth century, was the German population of Michalovce, which we find in the old settlements of the County of Užhorod, namely Tibava, Trnava nad Laborcom and Vinné, and at the village of Staré in Zemplín. In their surroundings, settlements administered by German law and with inhabitants classified as guests (*hospites*) were gradually formed. However, the whole improvement movement required a larger population, so as the process continued, Magyars and Ruthenians as well as local Slovaks and apparently all who fulfilled the economic and legal conditions, were accepted into the socio-legal group of guests.⁶ The mandate of Queen Elizabeth from 1343 already provides reliable evidence of this increased demographic movement. At the request of Laurence son of Andrew of Tibava, Queen Elizabeth authorized any free person to move to his property in the counties of Užhorod, Zemplín and Szatmár, and gain being free from all duties during the three years-time from this.⁷ In 1358, when the Chapter of Eger distinguished a filial quarter for Euphrosine daughter of John of Micha-

⁵ B. Varsík, *Z osídlenia západného a stredného Slovenska v stredoveku*. [From the settlement of western and central Slovakia in the Middle Ages] Bratislava 1984, 152–154. Uličný, Ref. 3, 24–27. V. Sedlák, “Zásahy do etnického zloženia staroslovenského historického areálu,” [Interventions in the ethnic composition of the old Slovak historical area] in *XII. Medzinárodný zjazd slavistov v Krakove. Príspevky slovenských slavistov*. Bratislava 1998, 253–255. Gy. Györffy, *István király és műve*. Budapest 2000, 313–314, 511, 513. M. Marek, *Cudzie etnika na stredovekom Slovensku*. [Foreign ethnic groups in medieval Slovakia] Martin 2006, 226–254. Gy. Kristó, *Nem magyar népek a középkori Magyarországon*. [Non-Magyar population in medieval Kingdom of Hungary] Budapest 2003, 81–120, 191–218.

⁶ V. Rábik, *Nemecké osídlenie na území východného Slovenska v stredoveku*. (Šarišská župa a slovenské časti žúp Abovskej, Zemplínskej a Užskej) [German settlement in the territory of eastern Slovakia in the Middle Ages. County of Šariš and the Slovak parts of the counties of Abov, Užhorod and Zemplín] Bratislava 2006, 346–348.

⁷ Gy. Nagy, ed. *A nagymihályi és sztárai gróf Sztáray család oklevéltára* [henceforth Sztáray okl.] Vol. 1, 1234–1396, Budapest 1887, 167, no. 88.

lovce, as an extensive lordship composed of 20 villages in the counties of Zemplín and Užhorod with inhabitants classified as guests. They included the villages of Vinné, *Greča, Jasenov and Trnava nad Laborcom, where we also find individuals of Ruthenian nationality at an early date. When the lords of Michalovce divided their property in Vinné in 1337, we learn that there were guests here of Ruthenian nationality, including a certain *Ozyph Rutenus*, although other names of guests point more to local Slovak origin of their bearers.⁸ Similarly in the village of *Greča, which later merged with Michalovce, guests of Ruthenian origin were also mentioned when the filial quarter was assigned to Euphrosine in 1358. They included "*Johannes Oruz*" (= Russian or Ruthenian) and Dymith (= *Dimitrij* from Greek *Demetrios*).⁹ According to all indications, Ruthenians also penetrated to Jasenov in the fourteenth century, as is shown by the protest of George and Ladislav of Tibava to John of Michalovce in 1356. John had attacked their village of Jasenov and had one of the local inhabitants, a man named *Makzey* (= Maxim), whipped.¹⁰ Therefore, in the case of Jasenov it is necessary to suppose that its establishment according to German law occurred not only with the participation of Slovak, but also of Ruthenian inhabitants, as happened in other villages of the lords of Michalovce, and especially in the neighboring village with the clearly ethnic name of Ruskovce. Individuals of Ruthenian nationality also penetrated into Trnava nad Laborcom, as is shown by a list of inhabitants produced by the monastery of Leles in 1449 on the occasion of a division of the lordship. Therefore, it is not surprising that we already find individual Ruthenians in the centre of the lordship - Michalovce - in the first half of the fifteenth century.¹¹

The above mentioned Ruskovce appears in written sources for the first time only in 1418 and 1419,¹² but there is no doubt that it was founded almost exclu-

⁸ Sztáray okl. 1: 123-138, no. 74: "*Ozyph [= Josiph] Ruteni hospitis de eadem Vynna... hospitum Chernuch et Peter vocatorum... Kochk et Mike hospitum de eadem.*"

⁹ Sztáray okl. 1: 299-303, no. 163: "*in ... possessione Geredche Johannem Oruz et Dymith hospites... inter sessiones Michaelis dicti Baynuk et Stephani fyellatoris.*"

¹⁰ Sztáray okl. 1: 255-256, no. 148. F. Uličný, *Dejiny osídlenia Užskej župy*. [History of the settlement of the County of Užhorod] Prešov 1995, 309, also supposes the presence of Wallachian population in Jasenov on the basis of information from a document from 1348 [Sztáray okl. 1: 209-210, no. 112], which mentions a Wallachian named Michal, apparently from Jasenov. However, this Wallachian only dealt with some unspecified business of his landlord in Jasenov, and when he left that village, he was attacked on the public highway by John son of Jakov [James] of Michalovce and imprisoned. A mandate from King Louis I entrusted Spiš Chapter with investigating the incident, but it is said that Michal the Wallachian came from Michalovce and the attack happened there. It is worth mentioning that the King appointed as his representative to investigate the case "*Ladislaus filius Kenez*", that is the son of a Wallachian hereditary mayor undoubtedly from the native village of Michal the Wallachian, which in this period could only be Koromľa.

¹¹ Sztáray okl. 1: 442-443, no. 315: Michalovce ("*Jacobus dictus Oroz... Georgius Oroz*"): Trnava nad Laborcom: ("*Stephanus Oroz, Boryzmikon, Wazyl, Boryz Hredel*").

¹² Sztáray okl. 2: 200-212, no. 50, 152 (1418), no. 153 (1419): "*Ruzkoch*". Uličný, Ref. 10, 200.

sively by Ruthenian inhabitants, as a result of which it was named after the nationality of its population in an environment with a Slovak ethnic and linguistic character. The settlement must have been founded according to German law, as is shown mainly by the fact that in 1427 it was listed among the taxed villages of the County of Užhorod.¹³ However, in 1576, the Ruthenian population fled from the village to the Ruthenians (perhaps meaning Polish Galicia) because of the murder of two servants of Stephen of Humenné, and so the decimal-collector of the County of Užhorod found only an abandoned village in which only the hereditary mayor remained.¹⁴ The vanished village of *Orozfalw, which lay outside the properties of the lords of Michalovce in the southern part of the County of Užhorod, must have had a similar origin. It is first mentioned in a document of the monastery of Leles from 1400, according to which it lay near Lekárovce and the Drugeth family exchanged it and Močiar with the prior of Leles for part of Veľké Kapušany.¹⁵ In 1419, Paul and Thomas, guests from Orozfalw, were among the witnesses in the case of an attack on Matthew Zelek a canon of Eger by Martin, parish priest of Pavlovce nad Uhom and his accomplices, guests from Ruská.¹⁶ According to the portal register from 1427 there were 14 farm grounds in the village in 1427,¹⁷ but the protest of the prior of Leles from 1478 about its unauthorized collection by the Dóob family from Ruská, is already the last known record of its existence.¹⁸ But let us return to the properties of the lords of Michalovce, where Koromľa must also be regarded as an originally Ruthenian village, also originally founded according to German law in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. The surviving epentetic 'l' in the name of the village is evidence of the Ruthenian origin of the original population,¹⁹ while its original foundation under German law in the context of the improvement programme of the lords of Michalovce is shown by the position of the inhabitants in the socio-legal position

¹³ DL.32382: "Rwzkoch," D. Csánki, *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában*. Vol. 1, [Historical geography of Hungarian kingdom under the rule of the Hunyadis] Budapest 1890, 298. Uličný, Ref. 10, 200.

¹⁴ MOL, Kamara, E 158, A 2669, *Connumeratio portarum comitatus Ung*, fol. 372: "Ruskoch: Nullus, nec colonus nec inquilinus praeter unum scultetum... tota possessio est deserta, nam coloni propter homicidium, eo quod duos servitores Stephani Homonnay occiderunt, ad Rutenos fugerunt."

¹⁵ E. Mályusz, ed. *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár* (henceforth ZsO) Vol. II/1, 1400–1405, Budapest 1956, 84–85, no. 728: "Orozfalw." Csánki, Ref. 13, 395. Varsik, Ref. 1, Vol. 3: 371. Uličný, Ref. 10, 168.

¹⁶ DL.43431: "ex scitu retulerunt... Paulus et Thomas hospites de villa Oruzfalu, vicini et commetanei predicti villa Ruzka..." 1419–1420. ed. I. Borsa. Budapest 2001, ZsO VII, 55, no. 99.

¹⁷ DL.32382: "Orozfalu prepositi de Leles [porte] 14." Uličný, Ref. 10, 168.

¹⁸ Slovenský národný archív (Slovak National Archive – henceforth SNA) Bratislava, Leleský konvent, Private Archive, 15th century, No. 453. Uličný, Ref. 10, 168.

¹⁹ J. Stanislav, *Slovenský juh v stredoveku*. Vol. 1. [The Slovak south in the Middle Ages] Bratislava 1999, 399; II. Turčiansky Sv. Martin 1948, p. 284. L. Kiss, *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára*. [Etymological vocabulary of the geographical names] 2 vols., Budapest 1997–1998, I, 781.

of guests in 1373²⁰ and information from 1454 about the original mill of the former hereditary mayor (*scultetus*).²¹ However, Koromľa is mainly known in literature as the village associated with the oldest record of the penetration of Wallachians, still meaning people of Rumanian nationality, into our territory. At the joint assembly of the counties of Užhorod, Bereg and Szabolcs in 1337, Jakov (James) son of Andrew and Ladislav son of Jakov of Michalovce protested against the fact that the deputy sheriff of the County of Užhorod and Villerm Drugeth's castellan magister *Gwd* from Nevický Castle had settled Wallachians in the territory of Koromľa. This led to a dispute lasting several decades.²² However, the mandate of the Palatine Villerm Drugeth from 8 August 1337 also provides evidence of the existence of Koromľa before the settlement of the Rumanian Wallachians. On the basis of the above mentioned protest of the lords of Michalovce, this mandate ordered the Chapter of Eger to define, on the basis of oaths by the parties to the dispute, the boundary between the Nevický lordship of the Drugeth family and the Tibava lordship of the lords of Michalovce, who were the first to found a settlement, as the document emphasizes, on the disputed land by the Orechovský potok stream, where the Wallachians were settled.²³ Therefore, the Wallachian element is a secondary phenomenon in Koromľa. However, it is clear from the documentary evidence that precisely the development of the property situation at Koromľa was especially important for the further penetration of the Wallachian population towards the west. We learn from a document of Louis I from 1365 about the complaints of George of Michalovce, according to which the Wallachians from the part of Koromľa occupied by the Drugeth family, namely John known as *Stroya*, *Dragomer* son of *Roman*, *Kalyman*, *Buna* and *Kalym*, whose names point to Rumanian origins, attacked Tibava, from which they drove away a herd of pigs. They left behind three better pigs and repeated the attack a week later.²⁴ Already earlier, in 1363, the assembly of the nobility of the County of

²⁰ Sztáray okl. 1: 396–405, no. 241.

²¹ Sztáray okl. 2: 513–532, no. 340.

²² Sztáray okl. 1: 120–121, no. 72: "*in quodam territorio Koromlya vocato ad possessionem ipsorum Tyba vocatam pertinenti... olahos descendere fecisset*". R. O. Halaga, *Slovanské osídlenie Potisia a východo-slovenskí gréckokatolíci*. [The Slavonic settlement of the Tisa region and the east Slovak Greek Catholics] Košice 1947, 79. Ratkoš, Ref. 1, 207. J. Žudel, "Zmeny v štruktúre osídlenia Východoslovenskej nížiny od začiatku 15. storočia do konca stredoveku," [Changes in the structure of settlement of East Slovak plain from the beginning of 15th century until the end of the Middle Ages] *Geografický časopis* 42:1 (1990), 78. Uličný, Ref. 1, 230. Beňko, Ref. 1, 280.

²³ Sztáray okl. I, 138–140, no. 75: "*quod cum iidem nobiles primitiales in sua fundati existant possessione,... in qua [terra litigiosa] nunc per vos [i.e., by the Palatine] olahii essent locate*."

²⁴ Sztáray okl. I, p. 344–345, no. 197: "*Johannes dictus Stroya, Dragomer, filius Romani de Korumle cum Kalyman, Buna et Kalym olachis*". In 1366, the monastery of Leles again investigated the complaint according to which the Druget family had taken 15 cattle and 60 sheep "*ratione collecte in iobagionibus suis Korumlyaiensibus*", certainly as Wallachian duties. Ministry of the Interior of the Slovak Republic, Štátny archív (State Archive – henceforth SA) Prešov, Archive of the Druget family from Humenné (henceforth Druget-H), I-97 (sign. A-11), no. 61.

Užhorod charged various criminals including a certain Ladislaus known as "Olah" or by another name "Vayas" but also Dragomer son of the Wallachian duke²⁵ Stanislav and Michael, also called "Olah". Their origin also needs to be sought in the environment of Koromľa, and a Rumanian element is also involved.²⁶ Only the verdict of the Palatine Imrich from 1373 definitively granted the lords of Michalovce possession of the whole of Koromľa, which became a permanent part of the lordship of Tibava. This made Koromľa the first village with Wallachian organization of the life of the inhabitants in the properties of the lords of Michalovce. It was also a stimulus for the origin of further similar villages in the lordship. Up to the end of the fourteenth century, the villages of Koňuš, Beňatina, Podhorod', Priekopa and Chořkovce in the lordship of Tibava and of Vyšná Rybnica in the lordship of Jasenov originated according to Wallachian law. In the fifteenth century, Wallachian inhabitants also penetrated into other older villages in the lordships of Tibava and Jasenov, as will be mentioned in detail.

In Koromľa itself, the Wallachian, but actually already Ruthenian population gradually became the dominant national and socio-legal element, when the original population was supplemented with settlement of guests. In 1437, when the monastery of Leles divided the lordship of Tibava between the sons of Edmund of Tibava and Albert of Michalovce on the orders of the land judge, Koromľa had 31 inhabited households and the monastery also recorded the names of the heads of the families. According to the list of names, Koromľa was a mainly Ruthenian village headed by Wallachian hereditary mayor or Kenez called Zan. The village also had a Ruthenian, that is Orthodox priest.²⁷

Vyšné Remety was originally founded sometime in the second half of the fourteenth century according to German law and with the participation of German inhabitants. It first appears in the sources in 1400,²⁸ but when the lordship of Tibava was divided in 1437, 28 of the 65 households in Vyšné Remety were abandoned and some of the inhabitants still had German names.²⁹ However, there was already a strong presence of the Ruthenian element, which probably penetrated to Vyšné Remety from nearby Vyšná Rybnica, which was actually founded according to Wallachian law. Indirect evidence of the penetration of the

²⁵ The special expression 'vojvod[a]' [translated as duke] in medieval charters relating the life of wallachian inhabitants cannot be considered as being a noble dignity, but it only represents the officer of their special administrative. The descent of this verb comes from Slavonian language and means, in fact, someone who leads.

²⁶ Sztáray okl. I, 330-332, no. 186: "*Ladislaum dictum Olah... Dragomer, filium voyvode Zanyzlai... Michaelum dictum Olah.*"

²⁷ Sztáray okl. II, 336-343, no. 237: "*curia sacerdotis Rutenorum.*" The house of the Ruthenian priest in Koromľa is also mentioned in 1454. Sztáray okl. 2: 513-530, no. 360: "*cum domo sacerdotis Rutenorum.*"

²⁸ Sztáray okl. II, 27, no. 22: "Remethe." Uličný, Ref. 10, 285.

²⁹ Sztáray okl. II, 336-343, no. 237. The Wallachian origin of the majority of the population is also documented by the portal list from 1427, in which Wallachians are not recorded, so that only six farm grounds were finally taxed. Dl.32382: "Remethe." Uličný, Ref. 10, 285.

Wallachian and ethnic Ruthenian population is provided by the mandate of the land judge Simon of Rozhanovce for the monastery of Leles in 1413. The mandate ordered investigation of the complaint of Peter of Michalovce, according to which the Wallachians Nicholas and John Drugeth from Humenné, living in the province of *Gyepüelve*, that is in the boundary area within the lordship of Humenné, raided the Vyšné Remety forest with the agreement of their landlords and took away 442 sheep belonging to the local inhabitants and to the inhabitants of Úbrež, but when their servants of Peter of Michalovce caught them at Pichne, the Wallachian dukes Stephen and Stan Drugeth prevented the return of the herd of stolen sheep.³⁰ At Vyšné Remety, the Wallachian and ethnic Ruthenian element later prevailed over the original Slovak and German inhabitants, and in 1449 the village appeared under the name "*Olahremethe*" (Valašské Remety).³¹ Secondary Wallachian population similarly penetrated into Porúbka, a village recorded for the first time in 1412, with its name clearly indicating a settlement founded under German law in a Slovak linguistic environment.³² At the time of the division of the lordship of Tibava in 1437, 18 of the 35 households in this village were abandoned,³³ and according to a document from the monastery of Leles from 1454, the mill of the local hereditary mayor had also been abandoned and burnt.³⁴ This documents the rapid decline of Porúbka, which the landlords endeavored to reverse by settlement of new inhabitants with a different, Wallachian socio-legal organization and Ruthenian nationality. The Wallachian element in Porúbka gradually prevailed, as was reflected in its late medieval name of "*Olahporubka*" (Valašské Porúbka), already recorded in 1497.³⁵ The village of Hliník, now part of Hlivíšť and Úbrež were undoubtedly also founded according to German law. The portal registers from the sixteenth century record the institution of hereditary mayors,³⁶ but the Wallachian and ethnic Ruthenian element already penetrated here during the fifteenth century. However, their original foundation according to German law is shown by the fact that in 1427 both villages were recorded among the taxed settlements of the County of Užhorod,³⁷ which would not have

³⁰ Sztáray okl. II, 125–126, no. 101. J. Beňko, *Osídlenie severného Slovenska*. [Settlement of northern Slovakia] Košice 1985, 266. Žudel, Ref. 22, 78. Ratkoš, Ref. 1, 208. Also compare the report of the Monastery of Leles from the same year. SNA Bratislava, Leles HM, Acta anni 1413, no. 54.

³¹ Sztáray okl. 2: 438–449, no. 315. For further documents compare: Žudel, Ref. 22, 78. Uličný, Ref. 10, 285.

³² SNA Bratislava, Metals comitatus de Ung, no. 43. Csánki, Ref. 13, 399. Uličný, Ref. 10, 187.

³³ Sztáray okl. II, 336–343, no. 237.

³⁴ Sztáray okl. II, 513–532, no. 360.

³⁵ SNA Bratislava, Archív Hodnoverného miesta pri Leleskom konvente [Archive of the authentic place at the Monastery of Leles – henceforth Leles HM], Acta anni 1497, no. 31. Žudel, Ref. 22, 78.

³⁶ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2669, fol. 95, 364, 671, 848 [Hlynnyk / Hliník scultetus, from 1571, 1576, 1582, 1588], 139, 182, 360–361, 671, 853 [Wbrys scultetus; from 1571, 1572, 1576, 1582, 1588].

³⁷ DL.32382: 'Hlynnyk,' 'Vbres.' Csánki, Ref. 13, 391, 399. Uličný, Ref. 10, 80, 244.

happened in the case of Wallachian villages. The penetration of Wallachian inhabitants into Úbrež is indirectly documented by the above mentioned complaint of Peter of Tibava from 1413 about the theft of pigs in the forest of Vyšné Remety by the Wallachians of the Drugeth family.³⁸ The portal registers from 1567 and 1588 document both villages as mainly Ruthenian and the register from 1588 records a Wallachian hereditary mayor called a *kenez* at Hliník.³⁹ It was typical of Wallachian villages that up to the middle of the sixteenth century they were not taxed according to the usual laws of the state,⁴⁰ and so the Wallachian villages in the County of Užhorod were not recorded in the oldest portal register, that from 1427, which is an important sign of their distinction from the villages based on German law, since their foundation documents are not preserved. However, there is also further evidence of the Wallachian origin of such villages in the territory of the County of Užhorod. In 1414, the county officer and deputy sheriff of the County of Užhorod investigated the destruction of the newly built village of Koňuš by the Wallachians of the Drugeth family from Ubľa with accomplices from Porhorod.⁴¹ Koňuš itself must have been built by Wallachians, although the medieval records are very limited. However, reliable records from the first half of the sixteenth century indicate the presence of Ruthenians and Wallachians in the village.⁴²

The Wallachian hereditary mayor called a *kenez* is already recorded in writing at Podhorod in 1476, when the villains of Master Imrich drove away 14 of his cattle. The landlord Simon of Tibava protested against this.⁴³ There was still a Wallachian *kenez* here at the time of collection of the portal tax in 1588.⁴⁴ The origin of Beňatina is directly connected with the origin of Podhorod. It already appears in the oldest documents with Podhorod as the second village below Tibava Castle (in 1418: *utramque Waralya*), so it is also necessary to suppose the Wallachian origin of its population, to which its ethnic development as a Ruthenian village also corresponds.⁴⁵ A Wallachian *kenez* named Nyeg is known from Chořkovce in

³⁸ Sztáray okl. II, 125–126, no. 101. SNA Bratislava, Leles HM, Acta anni 1413, no. 54.

³⁹ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2669, fols. 56, 58, 848, 853–854: "*Hlinnyk: Petrus kenez scultetus*"; "*Ubrys... domus sunt combustae per Ruthenos!*" [from 1567]. The expression "*kenez*" means a hereditary mayor of Wallachian village.

⁴⁰ *Decreta regni Hungariae. Gesetze und Verordnungen Ungarns*. Vol. I, 1301–1457. ed. F. Döry, G. Bónis, V. Bácskai. Budapest 1976, 381, legal article 9 from 1454; Vol. 2: 1458–1490, 111, 115, legal article 6 and 20 from 1459: "*Rutheni, Wolachi et Sclavi [fidem Wolachorum tenentes], qui alias lucrum camere solvere non consueverunt, ad solutionem eiusdem lucri camere non compellantur.*"

⁴¹ Sztáray okl. II, 142–143, no. 112. Uličný, Ref. 10, 181, 120.

⁴² Uličný, Ref. 10, 120, according to data from the urbarium from 1549. The portal registers from 1578 describe the inhabitants of Koňuš as Ruthenians. MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2669, fol. 315: "*Konyus Ruteni*"

⁴³ SNA Bratislava, Leles HM, Acta anni 1476, no. 21: "*cuiusdam kenezy in... possessione... Waralya commorantis.*" Žudel, Ref. 22, 78.

⁴⁴ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2669, fol. 843: "*Warallia: Stephanus kenez scultetus* [!]."

⁴⁵ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2669, fol. 59, 843 [from 1567 and 1588]. Compare also Uličný, Ref. 10, 31–32.

1409, when together with Laurence son of Berchen he testified about a quarrel and struggle of the inhabitants of Choňkovce Benedict, Andrew and Stanislav son of Balka with Matthew a villain of Peter of Tibava. This record is also the first written mention of the existence of the village.⁴⁶ The village of Priekopa is also of Wallachian origin. It appears in the sources for the first time only in 1418 and 1419,⁴⁷ but at the time of the division in 1437, there was already a numerous Ruthenian population and the monastery of Leles also recorded the name of the local Wallachian hereditary mayor – *Blasius kenez*.⁴⁸ Therefore it does not appear in the portal register of the County of Užhorod from 1427. The villages of Jovsa and Vyšná Rybnica in the territory of the lordship of Jasenov, first mentioned in writing only in 1418 and 1419,⁴⁹ must also be identified as being of Wallachian origin, as is indirectly shown by their absence from the portal register of 1427. The portal register from 1588 recorded the existence of Wallachian hereditary mayors called *kenez* in both villages.⁵⁰ All the above mentioned Wallachian villages in the territory of the Slovak part of the County of Užhorod had mainly Ruthenian populations according to the portal registers from 1567 and 1588, so it is remarkable that in the course of modern history the Slovak element prevailed in them. Already according to the official dictionary of settlements from 1773, no language other than Slovak was spoken in any of them.⁵¹ In the territory of the County of Zemplín, the beginnings of the settlement of Ruthenians were also associated with the widespread movement of settlement according to German law, for which the nearby Galician and Polish regions were available as a natural source of population. Therefore, it is not surprising that already in 1361 we have specific information about the arrival of such population, in the form of a mandate from Louis I. At the request of Ladislav and Laurence of Rozhanovce, the monarch forbade his castellans and officials to charge tolls on people coming to settle in the lands of these noblemen. The document explicitly emphasized that this included settlers from Poland and Galicia.⁵² This especially involved the territory of the lordship of Čičava with its centre in Vranov, where there was an intensive, directed and systematic settlement program from the middle of the fourteenth century.

When the lordship of Čičava was divided between the lords of Rozhanovce in 1363, the properties included the village with the ethnic name Ruský Kazimír.

⁴⁶ Sztáray okl. II, 58–59, no. 49: “*ad possessionem Hunkolch... presente Nyegh kenezius.*”

⁴⁷ Sztáray okl. II, 200–212, nos. 150, 152 and 153.

⁴⁸ Sztáray okl. II, 336–343, no. 237.

⁴⁹ Sztáray okl. II, 200–212, no. 150, 152 and 153. Uličný, Ref. 10, 108, 282.

⁵⁰ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2669, fol. 850–851 [*Kis Rybnicze: Stephanus kenezyk! scultetus!*], 855–856, [*Josza: Roman kenez scultetus!*].

⁵¹ *Lexicon locorum regni Hungariae populosorum officiose confectum*. Budapestini 1920 (henceforth: *Lexicon 1773*) 288–290.

⁵² DI.5061: “*possessiones... populorum numerositate et multitudine decorate intendamus... mandamus, quatenus ab omnibus populis et iobagionibus... de partibus Polonie et Rutenie... commorandi causa ad eorum possessiones venire volentibus nullum tributum... petere et exigere... presumpnatis.*”

Among the newly built villages in the valley of the Ondava, where the duration of being free from all duties for inhabitants living in it still applied, the village of **Urusuagasa* (meaning as Russian worked out place) appears, a name also reflecting the Ruthenian origin of the population.⁵³ However, **Ruská Voľa* does not appear in further sources. It soon disappeared, like some other villages mentioned as newly built in 1363, and so its site cannot be reliably identified with the present settlement of *Ruská Voľa* in the vicinity of Lomné, although the geographical context does not exclude it.⁵⁴ *Ruský* (today *Vyšný*) *Kazimír* remained a permanent part of the lordship and the name of the founder of the village – *Kazimír* points to a Polish – Galician context.⁵⁵ However, *Zemplín* also contained an older village with the name *Kazimír* situated south-west of *Trebišov*. After the building of the new village in the Ondava valley by the Ruthenians, it received the ethnic name of *Maďarský Kazimír* (in 1773: *Magyar Kazmer*).⁵⁶ However, the village of *Ruský Kazimír* preserved its ethnic character in modern times. This was also under the influence of a new influx of Ruthenians in the mid fifteenth century and in the sixteenth century, who did not have the characteristic duties of Wallachians, but had the position of free men, who performed services in the *Vranov* noble curia, as recorded by the portal register from 1567 and the *urbarium* from 1585, which describe it as an old obligation.⁵⁷ In the settlement area of the Ondava valley, where Ruthenian population was mainly concentrated as we have seen, the village of *Bžany* was established according to German law sometime after 1363. It is first documented in writing in 1372,⁵⁸ and it must have been a village settled by Ruthenians from the beginning. However, *Bžany* almost perished during the Hungarian – Polish war of 1491–1492, since in 1493 four of the five farms here were abandoned, and the only inhabited farm belonged to the hereditary mayor of the place *Ignath*, whose name reliably documents the older Ruthenian ethnic environment of the village.⁵⁹

⁵³ DL.5191: "*Kazmer Rutinicalis... novis villis sub libertatibus adhuc gavisus... Urusuagas.*"

⁵⁴ Beňko, Ref. 30, 256. It is necessary to observe that the present settlement of *Ruska Voľa* is a more recent settlement, about which we have information only from the official lexicon of settlements from 1773, but it was also a village in which the population spoke Ruthenian. See: *Lexicon 1773*, 301.

⁵⁵ For documents compare: F. Uličný, *Dejiny osídlenia Zemplínskej župy*. [History of Zemplín county's settlement] Michalovce 2001, 443.

⁵⁶ *Lexicon 1773*, Ref. 51, 299.

⁵⁷ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2677, fol. 25: "*Kazmir... omnes sunt libertini inquilini et... laborant in curia Varanoviensi a temporibus multis.*" Compare also the data in Uličný, Ref. 55, 443. According to an *urbarium* from 1648, there was some amendment of settlement conditions (certainly as a result of colonization) by Sebastian of Rozhanovce (died 1461) around the middle of the fifteenth century. The free position of the people of *Kazimír* and their duties were apparently fixed then and recorded in a document, which still existed in 1648. A. Hidegpataki, Antal, ed. "*Adalékok Csicsva vára és tartozékai történetéhez. A vár és tártozékai 1585-i [magyar nyelvű] urbáriuma,*" *Adalékok Zemplén-vármegye Történetéhez* 10 (1904), 308.

⁵⁸ DL.5999: "*Bozpatak.*"

⁵⁹ DL.19963: "*Boz yas... una sessione populos... Ignath solthez.*"

A settlement called "*Palyon*" is also recorded in 1372 among the new villages in the lordship.⁶⁰ We have no later information about it, but it is probable that, as a result of its soft structure, this name is of East Slavonic origin and so this was also a Ruthenian village, which corresponds to the fact that it is mentioned together with Ruský Kazimír in the 1372 document and could have been situated close to it in the valley of the Ondava.

The origin of the village of Nižná Oľšava, which can also be reliably identified as a Ruthenian settlement, can also be placed in this context, while the older village of Vyšná Oľšava had only Slovak inhabitants at first. This Vyšná Oľšava is already mentioned in 1382 and only one settlement with the name „Oľšava“ existed here.⁶¹ However, Ruthenians must soon have begun to settle in its territory, and they built a new village, already recorded in 1391.⁶² Such ethnic correlation of the two settlements is also illustrated by a document from the Chapter of Buda in 1493, according to which Vyšná Oľšava already had only three inhabited farms and one of them was occupied by a certain Blasius Pethryk, undoubtedly of Slovak origin, while in Nižná Oľšava, the representatives of the chapter similarly recorded only three inhabited farms, one of them inhabited by a certain Alexius, whose name was already Ruthenian.⁶³ Thus, only Ruthenian and Wallachian inhabitants penetrated into both abandoned Oľšavas in the first half of the sixteenth century, but the *urbarium* from 1585 recorded a tradition that the village of Vyšná Oľšava was originally Slovak. The writer emphasized that this village originally had a Slovak population and the Ruthenians only came later, while Nižná Oľšava was always a Ruthenian village.⁶⁴ As can be seen from the cases of Vyšná and Nižná Oľšava, the Polish invasion of eastern Slovakia in 1491–1492⁶⁵ significantly influenced the further development of the settlement and demographic situation. This significantly complicates the problem of researching the ethnic origin of the inhabitants of the settlements in the lordship of Čičava in the Middle Ages. However, it is from precisely this lordship that we have the most detailed data about the results of this war, because in 1493, the Chapter of Buda had a register compiled for the purpose of determining the filial quarter in the

⁶⁰ Dl.5999: "*Palyon, Kazmer.*"

⁶¹ Dl.6962: "*Olcwa.*"

⁶² Dl.7661: "*inferior Olswa.*"

⁶³ Dl.19963: "*Item in villa Felsewolchwa... Blasius Pethryk resideret... Item in villa Alsoolchwa... Alexius resideret.*"

⁶⁴ Hidegpataki, Ref. 57, 307: "*Also Olswa... mert az oroz faluk [!] ... Ez az Felseö Olsva előszeör thott falu volt es totok laktanak benne. Immar orozok szallottak rea.*" Vyšná Oľšava was also recorded as a Ruthenian village in a tithe register from 1571. MOL E 159, X. 4214, part 17, Regesta decimarum – Districtus Waranno et Ztropko: "*Felseo Olsua Rutteni.*"

⁶⁵ F. Uličný, "Poľské vpády na Slovensku v druhej polovici 15. storočia," [The Polish invasions of Slovakia in the second half of the 15th century] *Historické štúdie* 15 (1970), 259–264. K. Baczkowski, *Walka o Węgry w latach 1490–1492. Z dziejów rywalizacji habsbursko-jagiellońskiej w basenie środkowego Dunaju.* [The War for Hungary of 1490–1492. From the history of the Habsburg – Jagiello rivalry in the Middle Danube Basin] Krakow 1995, 98–104, 117–133.

property of the whole lordship. This record shows that more than 54% of the total number of farms were abandoned.⁶⁶ However, it is important for the further development of ethnic relations, that if we compare the document from 1493 with the ethnically Ruthenian villages of the lordship of Čičava as we know them from the sixteenth century, we come to the reliable conclusion that sometime in the first half of the sixteenth century, the Wallachian and Ruthenian population penetrated exclusively into the villages that were most depopulated. The *urbarium* from 1585 records the following as Wallachian villages with mainly Ruthenian populations: Valkov, Bžany, (Ruský) Kručov, Lomné, Benkovce, Dobrá nad Ondava, Vyšná and Nižná Oľšava, Ruský Kazimír, Davidov, Banské and Rudlov. It was only sometime in the first half of the sixteenth century that they built a new village of Jusková Voľa.⁶⁷

*

However, the Polish invasion of eastern Slovakia had a similarly strong impact on the lordship of Stropkov, which appears in the mid sixteenth century as a territory much settled by Ruthenian inhabitants. It is necessary to say that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the surroundings of Stropkov were a strong area for the foundation of villages according to German law. When King Sigismund granted the lordship to Imrich of Perín in 1408, it included 30 villages, at least ten of them with names recorded in connection with this settlement movement.⁶⁸ Thus, earlier and more permanent settlement of Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants in the territory of the lordship of Stropkov cannot be securely documented from medieval sources, rather the opposite. In 1442, the magistrate of Stropkov complained to Bardejov about the Wallachians from the neighboring Lordship of Makovica, who were freely and without restraint moving in the territory of the Lordship of Stropkov and causing damage there.⁶⁹

However, in spite of the absence of medieval documents, it can be considered almost certain that the Ruthenians also came here as secondary settlers in older settlements sometime in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, as is indirectly

⁶⁶ DL.19963. The document is analysed in detail in: P. Ratkoš, "O osídlení Čičavského hradného panstva koncom 15. storočia," [On the settlement of the Lordship of Čičava at the end of the 15th century] *Nové obzory* 6 (1964), 109-112.

⁶⁷ Hidegpataki, Ref. 57, 299-320. However, there was also Ruthenian population at Remeniny and Matiaška, and Orthodox priests were active in them in 1601. MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2677, fol. 748. The document of the Chapter of Buda from 1493 shows the following situation in the villages where we find Ruthenian and Wallachian inhabitants in the sixteenth century: Valkov - 2 [occupied farms] / 5 [abandoned farms]; Bžany - 1/4; Kručov - 1/7; Lomné - only generally mentioned; Benkovce - 5/3; Dobrá nad Ondava - 8/5; Vyšná Oľšava - 3/8; Nižná Oľšava - 3/5; Ruský Kazimír - 3/3; Davidov - not mentioned; Banské - 2/7; Rudlov - 1/14; Veľký Remenín - 5/6; Malý Remenín - 3/7; Matiaška - not mentioned. The villages mentioned only generally or not at all in the list were undoubtedly entirely abandoned. DL.19963.

⁶⁸ DL.9404/1-6. Beňko, Ref. 30, 258, 273. Rábik, Ref. 6, 306-317.

⁶⁹ B. Iványi, Béla, ed. *Bártfa szabad királyi város levéltára*. [The archive of the free royal town Bardejov]. Vol. 1, 1319-1526, Budapest 1910, 69, no. 386.

shown by the case of the village of Staškovce, already documented in 1408 as *Staskenhaw* and in 1430 as *Staswagasa*.⁷⁰ From the earliest times, possession of Staškovce was divided with the western part of the village, also called Veľké Staškovce belonging to the neighboring Lordship of Makovica, where it appears in the sources from 1414 as "*Staskwagasa*",⁷¹ while the eastern part - Malé Staškovce remained the property of the lordship of Stropkov. Especially in the Makovica part of Staškovce we can see clearly that the village underwent gradual ethnic and social change, and sometime in the second half of the fifteenth century it was settled by Ruthenian and Wallachian inhabitants. We know specifically that the *urbarium* of the lordship of Makovica from 1507, which actually describes the situation before 1490, describes Staškovce as a Ruthenian village.⁷² The Stropkov part of Staškovce must have undergone a similar development. However, the *urbaria* of the lordship of Stropkov from 1557, 1567 and 1569 distinguish in detail between the Slovak and Ruthenian villages of the lordship. The latter did not pay the landlord's ninth or the church tithes. The Ruthenian villages included Pravrovce, Varechovce, Staškovce, Bukovce, Brežnička, Vojtovce, Potočky, Solník, Pucák, Závada, Kajňa, Rohožník, Piskorovce, Tokajík, Hrabovec, Mrázovce, Miňovce, Krišlovce and Jakušovce. Only Poruba had a mixed population of Ruthenians and Slovaks.⁷³

However, the influence of the Ruthenian and especially of the socially Wallachian population on the socio-ethnic character of the territory of the County of Zemplín was especially significant in the lordship of Humenné, a holding of the Drugeth family. Already in the sixteenth century it had a special position in the administrative organization of the county using the originally Wallachian term "*krajňa*" for administrative divisions of the northern and north-eastern part of the lordship.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Dl.9404/1-6 (1408); Dl.70857 (1430).

⁷¹ Dl.10187. F. Uličný, *Dejiny osídlenie Šariša*. [History of the Settlement of Šariš] Košice 1990, 346.

⁷² Egyetemi Könyvtár Kézirattára, Budapest (henceforth EKK), Litterae et epistolae originales, no. 7, fol. 8^v-9^r, 10^r: "*Possessiones Ruthenorum... Sthaskocz*." Compare also: ŠA Prešov, Druget H, I-66: "*possessionibus Ruthinorum... Sthaskowcz*" (from 1514).

⁷³ MOL Budapest, Urbaria et Conscriptiones (henceforth U et C), Fasc. 4, no. 48 (1557: "*Sequuntur Rutheni, qui neque nonam, neque decimam tenentur de frugibus*"); Fasc. 113, no. 1 (1567). Urbáre feudálnych panstiev na Slovensku, (Urbaria of Feudal Lordships in Slovakia), (henceforth Urbáre). Vol. 1. ed. R. Marsina, M. Kušík, Bratislava 1959, 237-244, no. 8 (1569). Compare also J. Beňko, et al. *Stropkov. Monografia mesta*. Martin 1994, 52.

⁷⁴ MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2677, 2678, fols. 67, 73, 83, 88, 95, 266, 354, 417, 531, 1157, 1155-1157, 1160: "*Krajna dominorum Homoniensium*", "*Kraynya nobilium de Zbugia*" (1567); "*Crayna*" (1570); "*Bona nobilium in Kraina*" (1578, 1582); "*Bona nobilium in krayna Homoniensium*" (1596); "*processus... krainik vocato*" (1635). Uličný, Ref. 55, 705. For a review of ideas on the institution of the krajňa see: E. Stavrovský, "*Makovické panstvo v 16.-18. storočí*," [The Lordship of Makovica in the 16th-18th centuries. A contribution to the settlement, ethnic and confessional organization of the population of north-eastern Slovakia]. *Zborník FFUK - Historica* 37 (1987), 72-75.

The oldest specific data about Ruthenians settled in the territory of the lordship of Humenné is found in a document from the Palatine Nicholas of Gorjan from 1379, according to which the judgment of a property dispute about the ownership of villages in the valley of the Laborec between the Drugeths and noblemen from Zbudské Dlhé, also included the village of Radvaň nad Laborcom with 23 occupied and two abandoned farms. The village also had a mill on the river Laborec and a wooden church for Ruthenian members of the Orthodox Church.⁷⁵ However, it still appears to have been a settlement under German law, as is suggested by the mill, which indicates an agricultural rather than a Wallachian orientation of the population.⁷⁶ More reliable evidence is provided by the origin of the neighboring village of Volica, which is also Ruthenian by origin and appears in the sources already in 1415 as *Vokycha* (!).⁷⁷ The name of this village comes from the Eastern Slavonic appellative *Volja*,⁷⁸ which corresponds to the Slovak appellative *lehota* (meaning the period during its are inhabitants free from all duties). The form *Volica* (similar meaning as *lehota*) is already Slovakized, which testifies to the Slovak ethnic environment of the district.⁷⁹ All the medieval villages with the name *Voľa* arose in eastern Slovakia in the context of settlement under German law with the participation of Ruthenian, but also Polish population, as we will see in other cases. Only the younger wave of names of this type, which appear only in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is associated with the settlement of a Wallachian, although also Ruthenian population, but by then its settlement conditions were already significantly modified compared to the primary medieval Wallachian population.

However, where the lordship of Humenné is concerned, Ruthenian, already Wallachian inhabitants penetrated here in the fourteenth century, mainly from the neighboring County of Užhorod, where, as we already mentioned, the Drugeth family already endeavored to settle Wallachians in the territory of Koromľa, belonging to Tibava, in 1337. Before 1402, a certain Wallachian *kenez Iwchwo* escaped to the territory of the lordship with 300 cattle and horses belonging to the villain Michael of Vojnatina and he demanded his return from the Drugeths.⁸⁰ We already mentioned the Wallachians and Wallachian dukes Stephen and Stan from

⁷⁵ DL658: "*Radwanya... unam capellam Rutinorum legneum.*"

⁷⁶ Beňko, Ref. 30, 261. However, no later than sometime in the fifteenth century, there must have been changes in the social structure of the population, because in the *urbarium* from 1560, we find a Wallachian population here, and the Wallachian form of administration – the *krajňa*. Urbáre 1: 217, no. 5.

⁷⁷ ŠA Prešov, Druget H, I-97, no. 47, sign. A-11. SNA Bratislava, Leles HM, Acta anni 1415, no. 57. ZsO 5: 135, no. 292. Uličný, Ref. 55, 603. But in the *urbarium* from 1560, the Ruthenians here ["*Volycha*"] as at Radvaň only had Wallachian obligations. Urbáre I, 220, no. 5.

⁷⁸ Kiss, *Földrajzi nevek*, II, 774. P. Ratkoš, "K otázke emfyteuzy na Slovensku," [On the question of emphyteuza in Slovakia] *Historický časopis* 8:1 (1960), 120.

⁷⁹ The neighbouring village of Hrabovec nad Laborcom, also founded according to German law, was the last Slovak village in the Laborec valley. Urbáre I, 217, no. 5.

⁸⁰ Sztáray okl. II, 28, no. 23.

the lordship of Humenné, who prevented the servants of Peter of Michalovce resituting stolen sheep of the Wallachians from Vyšné Remety and Úbrež. However, an especially noteworthy point in the description of these events by the monastery of Leles is that both voyvodes were appointed to their function with authority in the whole lordship of Humenné, precisely by the Drugeth family,⁸¹ which corresponds to the above mentioned orientation of this family to the economic organization of the lordship on the basis of Wallachian population. In 1479, Ladislav Drugeth of Humenné, expecting an early death, divided the property of the lordship in front of the Monastery of Leles, setting aside a filial quarter for his sister Catherine. He described the villages in the lordship as being inhabited by native "Hungarian", meaning Slovak, and by "Wallachian", meaning Ruthenian, inhabitants.⁸² We learn more specific information about some of these Wallachian and Ruthenian villages from the investigation of the deeds of the band of outlaws of the Wallachian Fedor Hlaváty, who attacked various villages in the lordship of Makovica in 1492. The members of his group included Ruthenians and Wallachians from Krásny Brod, Hostovice, Pčoliné, Starina, Kolbasov, Ulič, Snina, Ruská Volová, Stakčín, Svetlice and a place called *Vološinec somewhere near Starina.⁸³ Jakub Piecz from Tarnová Góra also wrote of Svetlice as a Wallachian village. He captured three members of Hlaváty's group there, as they were escaping to Poland and informed Bardejov about this.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Sztáray okl. II, 125–126, no. CI: "*Stephanus et Sthan vaivode per prefatos filios Drugeth in dicto districtu Gepel constitute.*" The name of the vojvod Sthan [= Stanislav] points to a Ruthenian origin of the Wallachians here.

⁸² DL.18253: "*castrum suum Barko vocatum cum singulis tam Hungaricalibus quam volahalibus possessionibus ad idem castrum pertinentibus.*" The fact that the wife of Ladislav Drugeth was Hedviga, daughter of the Galician *vojvod/duke Stanislav, undoubtedly stands behind the special mention. After the death of Ladislav in 1484, she declared that she felt like a foreigner in Hungary and wanted to return to Poland. DL.18934: "*generosa domina Adviga relicto condam Ladislai de Homonna, filia scilicet condam magnifici Stanislai wayvode de Halycha de regno Polonie... ipsa defuncto prefato Ladislao de Homonna tanquam advena relicta fuerit... in suam propriam, puta regnum Polonie reverti proposuerit.*"

⁸³ ŠA Prešov, Pobočka Bardejov, Magistrát mesta Bardejov [Bardejov Branch, Bardejov town administration], nr. 2878, 3031, 3070: "*filius sculteti de Crasnibrod Iwan... Llphur de Crasznibrod... Llucacz scultetus de Crasznibrod... Senko Rutheni de Crasni Brod... Michno, Jaczko and Maczko fratres de Hostowicza... de Pczelina Hermi Stecz, Coporow Fedwr... de Starina Waszil... de Kobassowa Sacha filius Iwan... de Ulicz Stecz, Roman, Climo... de Swina Brenza... de Wolowa Simko... capitaneus supremus Ffedur Hlawathi, Kopacz frater Hlawathi, Danko de Wolowa... Alexius de Wolowa... Steffko Schestrynec de Wolowa... de Staccyn filius Hricz Micha... Czigan [!] de Suetnicza... Roman de Wolessencz.*" Compare: A. Húščava, "O činnosti zbojníckych družín na severovýchodnom Slovensku na konci 15. storočia," [On the activity of bands of outlaws in north-eastern Slovakia at the end of the fifteenth century] *Historické štúdie* 2 (1956), 181–182. Beňko, Ref. 30, 267–268.

⁸⁴ S. Sroka, ed. *Dokumenty polski z archiwów dawnego królestwa Węgier*. Vol. 3. (*Dokumenty z lat 1481–1500*). [Polish Documents from the Archives of the Former Kingdom of Hungary III. Documents from 1481–1500]. Krakow 2003, 194–195, no. 535: "*captivos habeo ex villa Stiewnicza minore [!] et quidem valachorum villa est.*"

However, the sources also document a higher concentration of Ruthenian inhabitants around Michalovce. We already stated above that some Ruthenians penetrated there from the beginning of the fourteenth century, and they gained the socio-legal status of guests in the lordship. We learn from a document of the Chapter of Eger from 1335 about the division of the property of noblemen from Naciná Ves, that west of Michalovce there were two villages with the name Voľa, the present village of Voľa in the valley of the Laborec north of Naciná Ves, and the former village of *Volica, a place situated somewhere in the present territory of Lesné and also originally called *Voľa*.⁸⁵ This village already appears under the Slovakized name of Volica in 1405, but in 1448 it was only an abandoned settlement.⁸⁶

The origin of the nearby settlement with the ethnic name of *Oroszfalva also undoubtedly fits into this context. It already existed in the property of the noblemen of Budkovce in 1366, and according to the definition of the properties of Pozdišovce and Suché by the monastery of Leles in 1437, it lay south of Suché on the road connecting the two villages.⁸⁷ However, this Ruthenian village was already abandoned by 1454.⁸⁸ Further evidence of the presence of a Ruthenian element in this area in the fourteenth century is provided by an investigation document of the monastery of Leles from 1371, according to which various serfs of Pongráč of Michalovce living in Zbudza and including a certain John known as "Oroz" (the Ruthenian), attacked the village of Úbrež in the County of Užhorod and stole a number of pigs.⁸⁹ However, this was only a matter of an individual as in the various properties of the lords of Michalovce. However, it is noteworthy that the oldest data about Wallachian inhabitants from the territory of the County of Zemplín does not come from the northern areas, where this population was mainly concentrated, but from the south, where we find the complaints of the noblemen of Cejkov from 1374, according to which serfs of noblemen from Vojka took more than 300 hundred of the pigs of their Wallachians from the forests in Brehov and *Kucany (today part of Oborín).⁹⁰ Only a few years later, in 1387, Wallachians are mentioned again in the villages of Veľké Trakany and Biel.⁹¹ In 1320, Veľké Trakany was already one of the villages where Thomas son of Korard

⁸⁵ Sztáray okl. I, 261, no. 151: "*Wolya iuxta fluvium Laborch... Wolya nuncupata iuxta metas... possessionis Lezna existens.*" In the letter of the land judge Nicholas of Seč from 1357, the two villages are designated as "*Volya et alia Volya*" [Sztáray okl. I, 267, no. 151].

⁸⁶ Sztáray okl. I, 44, no. 35: "*ad faciem possessionis Wolycha.*" Sztáray okl. II, 409, no. 295: "*predii Volicza... predio Volicza.*"

⁸⁷ Dl.67141: "*Orozfalwa.*" ZsO 6: 592, no. 2406: "*Orozfalw*" (from 1422). Gy. Dongó, "Pazdics és Szuha helységeknek határjárólevele 1437-ből," *Adalékok Zemplén-vármegye Történetéhez* 19 (1913), 193–199: „via de possessione Zucha duceret ad predictam Oroz-falu vocatam” (from 1437).

⁸⁸ Dl.14780: "*predium Orozfalw*". Uličný, Ref. 55, 376.

⁸⁹ Sztáray okl. I, 373–374, no. 224: "*Johanne dicto Oroz.*"

⁹⁰ SNA, Bratislava, Leles HM, Acta anni 1374, no. 4: "*porcos... olachorum eorum... porci olachorum.*"

⁹¹ SNA, Bratislava, Leles HM, Acta anni 1387, no. 1. Uličný, Ref. 55, 701.

was allowed to settle new inhabitants, according to an authorization from the Sheriff of Spiš Philip Drugeth.⁹² The presence of Wallachians at this place appears to have been directly connected with this. The engagement of the Drugeth family in the whole affair deserves special attention. However, we do not have information about a more continuous presence of Wallachians in this area. The penetration of Ruthenian inhabitants can also be documented relatively early in the case of the County of Šariš, and its earliest phase here is also part of the extensive settlement movement according to the principles of German law. We learn from the sale document of the extensive property of Krížovany by Dominic of Trst'any to Nicholas of Perín in 1318 that a village called "Voľa" was situated very close to the property.⁹³ We have no other information about this village, but it is entirely possible that it appears later under the name of *Volica*, which is mentioned as an abandoned settlement in 1454 in connection with a new grant among the properties of noblemen from Široké, Bertotovce and Fričovce.⁹⁴ As we already mentioned, the name Voľa of which Volica is a Slovakized form, is of Polish and Galician origin, and in eastern Slovakia it is an import from that area, found among the names of villages established by Ruthenian inhabitants according to German law. We have concrete evidence from as early as 1340 of the presence of Ruthenians somewhere in the property of Krížovany, and they were probably inhabitants of the above mentioned village of *Voľa - Volica. In that year, Pope Benedict XII at the request of Nicholas of Perín authorized the Archbishop of Esztergom to organize a visit to the new monastery of the Friars Minor built in Krížovany at the expense of Nicholas. He also informed the Pope about the complicated religious situation in his property, since the inhabitants of Krížovany and the neighboring villages included Ruthenians, who were schismatics, that is they belonged to the Eastern Christian rite.⁹⁵ The presence of Ruthenians is also confirmed by a record from 1358, when a certain Nicholas called *Oroz* (Ruthenian)⁹⁶ appears in a dispute about a filial quarter from the property of Krížovany and Hrabkov, as the servant

⁹² V. Sedlák, ed. *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Slovaciae* [henceforth RegSlov] Vol. 2. Bratislava 1987, 252, no.523. V. Rábik, "'Commorandi causa.' Príspevok k migrácii obyvateľstva na východnom Slovensku v procese doosídľovania na nemeckom práve. [A contribution to migration in eastern Slovakia in the process of settlement according to German law] *Studia historica Tyrnaviensis* 3 (2003), 183.

⁹³ RegSlov II, 164, no. 333: "*que via dividit et separat metas Vola a metis predictae possessionis ita, quod Vola manet ab aquilone, Zenthkerezth vero a parte meridionali.*"

⁹⁴ DI.25210; DI.38991: "*atque predia... Wolicza appellate.*" *Volica still appears as a *predium* in 1510. DI.39086: "*predia ... Wolycza.*" The village must have disappeared before 1427, because it does not appear in the portal register of the County of Šariš from that year. DI.32690.

⁹⁵ C. Wagner, ed. *Diplomatarium comitatus Sarosiensis* [henceforth DCS]. Possonii et Cassovia 1780, 519–520, no. VII: "*prasertim cum ipsi populi habeant immediate intra se Ruthenos qui sunt schismatici.*" *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia*. Vol. 24. [1340]. ed. F. Piti, Budapest-Szeged 2001, 242–243, no. 529.

⁹⁶ I. Nagy, ed. *Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis. Anjoukori okmánytár* (henceforth AO) Budapest 1920, VII, 523–524, no. 278: "*Nicolaus dictus Oroz.*"

and representative of the noblemen of Bertotovce, Fričovce and Široké. He could have come only from the above mentioned village of *Voľa.

*

However, another village of Voľa existed in the first half of the fourteenth century somewhere in the surroundings of Sabinov. In 1358 Nicholas called Apród (*varlet*) from Šarišské Sokolovce with his sons authorized Dominic son of Laurence and George son of Andrew to settle their property with the name "*Wolya*" according to the freedoms of the burghers of Sabinov.⁹⁷ Again, no further information about the new settlement has survived, which testifies to failure of the project, but the name of the property is evidence of an older Ruthenian settlement, founded according to German law. The settlement of Ruthenians on properties of the Mičkbán family in the upper part of the Ondava valley also undoubtedly falls into the context of settlement according to German law. When Nicholas son of Lorand and grandson of the Bán of Slavonia Mičko defended his property rights before the land judge against the Tekule family, which involved their extensive property of Smilna, he also mentioned "a certain village in which the inhabitants were Ruthenians."⁹⁸ It is very probable that this concerned the Ruthenian village included among the properties of the Makovica lordship under the ethnic name *Orozfulu* in 1414.⁹⁹ This village is also mentioned in further documents about the properties of the lordship of Makovica, appearing for the last time in 1470.¹⁰⁰

The village of **Orozfalw* is also recorded in the portal register of the County of Šariš from 1427, when 28 farm gates (portals) were taxed here,¹⁰¹ which shows that this Ruthenian community could not have settled here under Wallachian law. However, we also find such communities in the properties of Magister Lorand in the mid fourteenth century. Later, in the first quarter of the fifteenth century a much larger Ruthenian and already Wallachian population must have penetrated into this region. Already in 1356 we have information that Lorand son of Mičko Bán with his serf Wallachians, Ruthenians and other servants attacked the village of Lomné in the County of Zemplín. They looted it and the hereditary mayor of the village Peter was killed.¹⁰² It is not known whether these Ruthenians were identical with the inhabitants of the village of **Orozfalva*, but if we also admit this possibility, they could not have been Wallachian, since the document from the land judge Nicholas of Sečany (Szecsén), which solved Lorand's excess-

⁹⁷ DCS 571–572, no.6.

⁹⁸ DI.4653. AO VI, 549–550, no. 349: "*et cuiusdam ville, cuius incole essent Ruteni.*"

⁹⁹ DI.10187.

¹⁰⁰ On the documents compare: Uličný, Ref. 71, 273–274. Ferdinand Uličný reliably locates this village in the territory of Jurková Voľa with the local name Rusinec.

¹⁰¹ DI.32690: "*Orozfalw Johannis eiusdem [Zudar] porte 28.*"

¹⁰² AO VI, 626–631, no. 410: "*Lorandus... quosdam iobagiones videlicet olahos, Rutenos et alios famulos suos ad quandam possessionem eorum Lona vatatam... potencia destinando.*" Beňko, Ref. 30, 255. Uličný, Ref. 55, 282.

es in 1357,¹⁰³ specifically distinguishes Lorand's Ruthenian accomplices at Lomné from the Wallachian population, although the latter were undoubtedly also of Ruthenian nationality, and from Lorand's other servants. Therefore, it appears that these Wallachians should be sought in another locality of the Mičkbán, or more probably they were not a Wallachian element with fixed settlements.

Strong penetration of Ruthenian population was already characteristic of the territory of the Makovica lordship in the Middle Ages, and a Wallachian organization of life is already recorded from these villages in the Middle Ages. The partial penetration of Orthodox Ruthenians into this region is recorded in an agreement between the Bishop of Eger Michael and the Cudar family in 1367, according to which the bishop gave up the collection of tithes from the properties of the Makovica and Kurima lordships in return for an annual payment of 200 florins, which was justified by the fact that these territories were too distant and lay on the frontier with the schismatics, and because of the pagan (that is Orthodox) rite used by the people, tithes could not be consistently collected.¹⁰⁴ We can see from this, that Ruthenian inhabitants penetrated into the Lordship of Makovica from the neighboring Polish part of Galicia, and from the fifteenth century we have relatively numerous mentions of them as Wallachians. In 1442, the town council of Stropkov complained to Bardejov about a foray of these Wallachians into their district, where they caused damage.¹⁰⁵ The captain of Ľubovňa Castle John of Maslov addressed a similar complaint to Bardejov in 1449, with information that the Makovica Wallachians had stolen horses from inhabitants of Krompachy.¹⁰⁶ Another captain of this castle, John Socha asked Bardejov for help in 1452 with the hunt for a Wallachian named Staník, who was accused of stealing sheep.¹⁰⁷ However, these Wallachians often also raided the territory of Poland. In 1444, the captain of the small town of Biecz Nicholas Pieniążek complained to the captain of Makovica Castle, that the Wallachians from Zborov had raided the forest near the village of Siary, where they stole 22 pigs.¹⁰⁸ But it is necessary to observe that this relates to the Wallachians in the Lordship of Makovica generally and not to Zborov, in the territory of which Makovica Castle stood. Zborov itself never had a Wallachian and Ruthenian population.

A Wallachian was already imprisoned in Bardejov in 1435 for counterfeiting coins, and the town council of Krakow encouraged the people of Bardejov to impose the strictest punishment and requested that they be immediately informed if

¹⁰³ AO VI, 626–631, no. 410.

¹⁰⁴ DL.24482: "*quod quia de quibusdam districtibus nostre dyoecesis confinibus scismaticorum existentibus propter nimiam localem distanciam et gentis novelle ritum paganisimum decime nobis et ecclesie nostre predictae provenientes satis indecenter actenus sunt administrate.*" Compare also note 4.

¹⁰⁵ Iványi, Ref. 69, 69, no. 386: "*wolahi de Macowicza.*"

¹⁰⁶ Iványi, Ref. 69, 94, no. 542.

¹⁰⁷ Iványi, Ref. 69, 111, no. 676.

¹⁰⁸ S. Sroka, ed. *Dokumenty polski z archiwów dawnego królestwa Węgier*. Vol. I. I. [do 1450 r.]. [Polish Documents from the Archives of the Former Kingdom of Hungary I. [up to 1450]. Krakow 1998, 107, no. 79: "*vachali [!] de Sborowa.*"

he revealed the names of his accomplices during torture.¹⁰⁹ In 1463, the captain of the Polish castle of Muszyna John Wolski asked the town council of Bardejov to send an executioner, because he had condemned to death by hanging a certain Wallachian, who had caused much damage to the people of Bardejov.¹¹⁰ Two Wallachians were burnt at Vranov in 1479 for counterfeiting coins. Bardejov informed Oswald of Rozhanovce about this, and we learn that they came from the territory of the Lordship of Makovica, at that time belonging to the Rozhanovský family.

In the 1480s, the captain of Plaveč Castle asked Bardejov town council to hunt down a Wallachian named Hawrylla, who had evaded paying tolls.¹¹¹ Thus, we can see from these records that the Wallachians often appear in the written sources as perpetrators of violence and crime, which caused considerable problems for the royal borough of Bardejov. As a result, the town council often adopted repressive measures against the Wallachians in the district.¹¹² It is not surprising that in 1472, the Sheriff of Spiš Imrich Zápoľský asked Bardejov not to persecute his spies – Wallachians named Buda and Myhno. They and their associates were often sent to Poland to obtain information for the king, because they were experts on the Polish frontier region.¹¹³ Bardejov itself used the Wallachians of the Makovica Lordship for intelligence services,¹¹⁴ and the people of Bardejov also employed Wallachians for the pasturing of cattle and as guides on the forest roads, especially on the way to Poland.¹¹⁵

It is noteworthy that the above mentioned reports are very unspecific about the places of residence of the Wallachians in the Makovica Lordship, but this information can be relatively reliably reconstructed from the overall development of settlement in the district. It is necessary to observe that the Ruthenian population with Wallachian socio-legal organization penetrated into the Lordship of Makovica in large numbers already from the beginning of the fifteenth century, as can be seen by comparing the state of the settlements from 1414 to 1417,¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁹ Iványi, Ref. 69, 55, no. 288: "*quendam walchum falsarium monete.*"

¹¹⁰ Iványi, Ref. 69, 222, no. 1459: "*quia valachum unum suspendemus, qui multa mala vobis fecit.*"

¹¹¹ Iványi, Ref. 69, 324, no. 2154.

¹¹² The town books of Bardejov from 1418–1444 contain various minutes on the capture of Wallachians. Compare: L. Fejérpataky, ed. *Magyarországi városok régi szamadáskönyvei*. Budapest 1885, 344a, 491b: "*Item pro expensis captivis Walachis.*"

¹¹³ Iványi, Ref. 69, 281–282, no. 1867.

¹¹⁴ Fejérpataky, Ref. 112, 343a: "*Item olachis pro exploratione ad Beecz*" [from 1433], 506b "*Item uni walacho exploratory,*" 507b: "*Item wolachis exploratoribus*" [from 1440].

¹¹⁵ Fejérpataky, Ref. 112, 491b: "*Item uni olacho, qui conduxit dominum Stephanum et ostendit ei viam per silvam*" [from 1439], 392b: "*Item solvimus Bartes walach, quos concessit Antil et Jacobo in Cracoviam equitantes cum Augustino*" [from 1438]. About the payment and provisions for Wallachians in the services of Bardejov compare also further data from the town books: Fejérpataky, Ref. 112, 344a–b, 346a, 347a, 391a, 483b, 486b, 506b, 507b, 518a, 601b, 602a, 606a.

¹¹⁶ DL10187 (1414); DL10333 (1415); DL10335 (1417/1417/1414/1415); DL10440 (1417). P. Ratkoš, "Vznik a osídlenie Makovického hradného panstva do začiatku 17. storočia,"

when all the villages in the lordship were included, to the state of the settlements according to the tax records from 1427, in which the Wallachian and so ethnically Ruthenian villages do not appear. From the total number of 65 villages in the Lordship of Makovica, only 52 appear in the portal register from 1427.¹¹⁷ Among the missing settlements, the village of **Thurospathak* had probably already disappeared, since it appears in no later sources, and it is possible to suppose temporary abandonment or natural disasters in the case of some other villages such as Poliakovce, Černina and Tisinec, but in these continuity of Slovak population was maintained, and they appear as Slovak villages in the *urbarium* from 1507.

However, in the case of the other villages, namely: Nižný and Vyšný Svidník,¹¹⁸ Nižný and Vyšný Orlík, Lodomirová, Becherov, Vyšný Tvarožec, Gribov and Dubová, their absence from the 1427 portal register can be explained only by new Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants, who were not subject to land taxation. They already appear as villages with Ruthenian and Wallachian population in the *urbarium* from 1507, which is based on the situation in the lordship before 1490.¹¹⁹ However, it is typical of the Ruthenian population in this period that the Wallachian element settled mainly in older villages, often originally established according to German law such as the above mentioned villages, and only secondarily in newly founded settlements as the Ruthenian population grew.

Undoubtedly such a development could only happen as a result of the decline of the original Slovak population, as occurred especially in the valley of the river Ondava already at the beginning of the fifteenth century, partly due to flight of the inhabitants, especially to Bardejov and the villages subject to it. Already from 1415, we have concrete evidence of mass flight of inhabitants from villages in the Lordship of Makovica, with more than 30 serfs of Simon Cudar fleeing to Bardejov and its village of Lukavice at the time of collection of the land taxes. However, the royal exchequer officer John Bubek confirmed the right of Bardejov and other royal boroughs not to give up the serfs of aristocrats, who moved to the town.¹²⁰ This was also a reason for the abandonment of settlements in the Lordship of Makovica. The Cudars and after them also the Rozhanovskýs endeavored to solve this population deficit by settling Wallachian and ethnically Ruthenian inhabitants. This inflow of people was stimulated especially by the reform and

[The origin and settlement of the Lordship of Makovica Castle up to the beginning of the seventeenth century] in *Príspevky k dejinám východného Slovenska*, Bratislava 1964, 44–45. V. Rábik, "Osídlenie a národnostný ráz Makovického panstva v stredoveku," [Settlement and national character of the estate Makovica in the middle ages]. *Historický zborník* 15 (2005), 26–54.

¹¹⁷ Dl.32690, fols. 7–10.

¹¹⁸ Wallachian hereditary mayors with the personal names Hayncz and Simon are recorded here from 1434. Beňko, Ref. 30, 232 (with a reference to ŠA Prešov, pobočka Bardejov, MMB, Protokol 1416–1443, fol. 19).

¹¹⁹ EKK Budapest, Lit. et ep. Orig., no. 7, fols. 9v–10r. Similarly also ŠA Prešov, Druget H, I-66 (from 1514).

¹²⁰ Dl.10395. ŠA Prešov. Pobočka Bardejov, fond Magistrát Bardejova, no. 77. ZsO V, 339, no. 1208, 543–544, no. 2017 (from 1416). Compare: Rábik, Ref. 92, 187–189.

unification of the obligations of the inhabitants to the lordship and "in the domain of Ladozírova" accepted by Reynold of Rozhanovce at the beginning of 1471, and directly emphasizing his effort to increase settlement of the lordship.¹²¹

The testimony of two Wallachians Ivan of Stebník and Prokop of (Vyšný) Tvarožec from 1518 also corresponds to this. With other inhabitants of the Wallachian villages, they testified before the judicatory of county in a dispute about possession of the Čierný les forest in the surroundings of Lukov. They told the story of events more than 40-50 years before. Another Wallachian from Snakov also said that he and others moved from Poland to Hungary at that time and settled in the forests of Malcov.¹²² It was precisely at that time that Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants penetrated into northern Šariš in larger numbers.

The above mentioned *urbarium* of the villages in the lordship written around 9 October 1507 is an important document testifying to the overall settlement penetration of Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants into the Lordship of Makovica in the Middle Ages.¹²³ The whole document is preserved only in draft form, but this is useful, because it includes data that would have been omitted from the finished copy. For example, it recorded that for every ten beehives Wallachians and Ruthenians had to deliver one basket or more precisely the honey and wax from the production of one hive, and for each hive they had to pay one florin.¹²⁴ However, this item was later crossed out and no further information more closely specifies the duties of Ruthenian and Wallachian villages, although the villages in the lordship were precisely differentiated in this spirit. The villages of Šarišské Čierne, Rovné, Stebník, Becherov, Varadka, Petrová, Vyšný Tvarožec, Dubová, Vyšný and Nižný Orlík (Vyšný Orlík was the seat of the Wallachian duke), Vyšný and Nižný Svidník, Bukovec (the writer added that the 6 inhabitants were divided into 3 Slovaks and 3 Wallachians – *tres Sclavi et tres wolochi*), Veľké Straškovce, Pstrina, Gribov, Vislava, Kružlová, Ladozírová and Vagríneč, were designated as Ruthenian settlements with Wallachian inhabitants. Orthodox priests, popularly called "baľko" and officially *plebanus Rutenus* were found in Stebník, Dubová, Vyšný Orlík and Gribov.¹²⁵

It is important to observe that such a division of villages was of older origin, as is shown by comparison of the data on individual villages with the document

¹²¹ DL.17161: "*volentes possessiones nostras ubique videlicet in pertinenciis Makowycza et Ladmer habitas populosas efficere.*" Ratkoš, Ref. 116, 47.

¹²² DL.69106.

¹²³ EKK Budapest, Lit. et ep. Orig., no. 7, fols. 1r-10v: "*Revisio castri Makowycza in comitatu de Saros adiacentis ac pertinenciarum eiusdem per magistros Stephanum de Werbewcz et Sigmundum de Pogan circa festum beati Dionisii martiris presentibus egregii Nicolao de Tharcz, Stephano de Segnye, Nicolao de Kapy et Johanne Weres de Roskwan anno etc. 1507 facta.*" Compare its edition: V. Rábik, "Urbáre Makovického panstva z roku 1507," [Makovica domain *urbaria* from 1507] *Slovenská archivistika* 41:2 (2006), 22-40.

¹²⁴ EKK Budapest, Lit. et ep. Orig., no. 7, fol. 1r: "*Et hoc in medio dumtaxat Rutenorum et wolachorum, non autem Christianorum.*"

¹²⁵ An Orthodox priest is already documented at Svidník [Vyšný or Nižný] in 1458, 1478 and 1492. Iványi, Ref. 69, 307, no. 2038. Beňko, Ref. 30, 232, 268.

of the Chapter of Buda from 1492,¹²⁶ by which the chapter distinguished the girls' quarters for the daughters of John and Oswald of Rozhanovce, and recorded in detail the state of settlement in the lordship after the devastating invasion in 1491–1492 by the Polish army of John Albert, who aspired to the throne of Hungary with the support of part of the Hungarian nobility after the death of King Matthias Corvinus.¹²⁷ Comparison of the document from 1492 with the *urbarium* from 1507 documents only minor changes in the settlement of the lordship and shows that even 15 years after the devastation, the district had not been regenerated with new inhabitants. This was also reflected in the total value of the Lordship of Makovica, as illustrated by the exchange between Sarah widow of John Tarczay from Sarišské Sokolovce and the Palatine Imrich of Perín. In exchange for the Lordship of Makovica, he gave Sarah the Lordship of Sečovce, which was composed only of the small town of Sečovce and another seven villages and two abandoned settlements. In this context, they again differentiated between the Ruthenian and Slovak villages in the Lordship of Makovica, giving a division faithfully corresponding to the *urbarium* from 1507.¹²⁸

However, the oldest known record of the presence of Wallachians in Šariš relates to the property of the Sóos family of Solivar, where we learn from the complaints of the noblemen of Kokošovce in 1402, that against their will, the Sóos family had settled Wallachians in the territory of Kokošovce, and the cattle of the Wallachians grazed on the crops.¹²⁹ Sometime around 1408, John Kokoš and his men (servants) attacked the Wallachians of Peter Sóos in the disputed woods and left them thoroughly thrashed as a warning to others.¹³⁰ However, it is impossible to say reliably whether this concerned the village of Nová Ves, already mentioned among the properties of the Sóos family in 1419. It only received the ethnic adjective "Ruská" in modern time. This village is registered among the taxed settlements of the County of Šariš in 1427, which suggested arable rather than pastoral farming.¹³¹

¹²⁶ Dl.3022. Specifically, it is possible to add that in 38 villages in the lordship in 1492, the total number of inhabited farms was 154. In 1507 the officials of the lordship counted in 48 villages only 221 inhabited farms and a further 43 cottages. In the context of the total number of farm portals taxed in 1427, when 52 villages in the lordship contained up to 1565 portals (Dl.32690, fol. 7–10), this represented a critical number and a deep decline of settlement in the lordship.

¹²⁷ Ref. 65.

¹²⁸ ŠA Prešov, Druget H, 1-66: "*castrum suum Makowicza vocatum in comitatu de Saros existens... ac possessionibus Ruthinorum Mernyk, Rona, Stebnyk, Alsozwydnyk, Bwkowcz, Bykharo, Waraczka, Petherwagasa, Alsothwrospathak, Dwbowia, Felseworlyk, Alsoorlyk, Felsewzwydnyk, Sthaskowcz, Byzthryna, Grebo, Wozlo, Krwso, Ladamer et Wagrincz.*"

¹²⁹ ŠA Prešov, Farkaš Z, no. 35: "*olahos inter possessionis eorum [sc. Delne]... potenciali condescendi fecisset... fruges ipsorum depasci fecissent.*" Uličný, Ref. 71, 438, 470.

¹³⁰ Dl.57531. ZsO VIII, 355–356, no. 1165: "*in silva propria ipsorum [sc. nobilium de Souar] Valahos ipsorum spoliando, quosdam ex isis diris vulnere plagis sauciasset*" (in a document from 1421).

¹³¹ ZsO VII, 251, no. 969. Uličný, Ref. 71, 273–274 supposes a mixed population of Wallachians and peasant farmers. Dl.32690: "*Wyfatw Nicolai Sos.*"

However, already sometime in the first half of the fifteenth century, the sources document the presence of the Wallachian element in the western part of Šariš in the properties of the Torysa and Kamenica lordships, where an intensive settlement process according to German law was in progress from the last third of the thirteenth century. It spread here from neighboring Spiš and also extended to the Lordship of Šarišský Hrádok. The model we saw in the Lordship of Makovica also applied here. Wallachians of Ruthenian ethnic origin penetrated into older settlements created according to German law, which were later abandoned. In an undated document from around 1400 of John deputy captain of Šarišský Hrádok, we learn that Ruthenians were already settled in the village of *Viliamvagasa from which the tithes required by the state laws did not have to be collected.¹³² This village already existed in 1345 under the name Wernerwagasa, together with Lúčka and *Harčár, which were located nearby,¹³³ but it must have been abandoned by the end of the fourteenth century, as were the neighboring settlements. Ruthenians with a Wallachian organization settled here around 1400. This is reliably shown by the fact that they do not appear in the portal register from 1427, although the neighbouring settlements did. However, this village also disappeared by the end of the Middle Ages. In 1522 it already only described as a deserted settlement (*predium*).¹³⁴

*

A document from the captain of Šarišský Hrádok Castle John of Kozojedy addressed to Bardejov in 1455 also testifies to the presence of Wallachians of Ruthenian nationality in the Lordship of Červený Hrádok. He asked the town not to intervene against the Wallachians under his administration, because he himself had no knowledge of their actions.¹³⁵ This concerned not only the Wallachians from the village of *Wernerwagasa, but apparently also from Olejníkov, first mentioned among the properties of the castle in 1454.¹³⁶ Olejníkov appears in the tithe register from 1538 as a Ruthenian village.¹³⁷ However, the Ruthenians must have penetrated at the same time into the village of Hanigovce, which had two parts by the end of the fourteenth century, one of which – Veľké Hanigovce – was granted to Peter of Šemše in 1392 by the king. This Hanigovce remained a Slovak village, while the other Hanigovce settlement was already abandoned in 1398.¹³⁸

¹³² ZsO 2/1: 90, no. 783: "*decimas... de Viliam Vagasa de omnibus Rutenis.*"

¹³³ AO IV, 488–489, no. 296. On the location compare: Uličný, Ref. 71, 352.

¹³⁴ DL69125.

¹³⁵ V. Chaloupecký, ed. *Středověké listy ze Slovenska. Sbíрка listů a listin, psaných jazykem národním z let 1426–1490*. [Medieval Letters from Slovakia. A collection of letters and documents written in the national language, 1426–1490] Bratislava–Praha 1937, 69, no. 77. Iványi, Ref. 69, p. 126, no. 774.

¹³⁶ DL24541: "*castrum Wywar... Olaypathak.*" Uličný, Ref. 71, 221.

¹³⁷ MOL Kamara, E 159, B. 1036, Regesta decimarum comitatus Sarosiensis, part 8: "*Olaynyk Rutteni.*"

¹³⁸ DL64681 (1392). DCS, 351–352, no. 47 (1398).

This abandoned settlement then became a property of the Lordship of Kamenica, and when it again appeared as an existing village with the name „Malé Hanigovce“ in 1404,¹³⁹ it had undoubtedly become a Ruthenian and Wallachian village. In 1479, an unnamed Wallachian hereditary mayor of Hanigovce was in Bardejov prison and the castellan of the Muszyna Castle in Poland John Białogrodzki testified about his offences. These included robbery in the small town of Nowy Sącz.¹⁴⁰ This Hanigovce is recorded in the tithe register from 1538 as a village inhabited by Ruthenians.¹⁴¹

Walachian and Ruthenian inhabitants settled in a similar way as a secondary element in other villages in the Lordship of Kamenica and Torysa. When Jakub of Brezovica mortgaged his property there to Michael Poch of Žehra in 1440, there was mention of Legnava, where Wallachians lived.¹⁴² However, the Wallachian population could have penetrated there only after 1427, when Legnava still appeared among the taxed settlements and we learn for the first time about its existence and the German origin of its name.¹⁴³ Legnava also appeared as a village with Ruthenian inhabitants in the decimal register from 1538.¹⁴⁴

Blažov also developed as a Ruthenian village with Wallachian inhabitants from the second half of the fifteenth century, although it was originally established according to German law by the founder Blažej of Brezovica in 1317.¹⁴⁵ However, in 1480 Wallachians already lived in Blažov, as we learn from the investigation documents of representatives of the County of Šariš, according to which they attacked the cart of Nicholas of Brezovica, which was returning from Žilina with a load of materials and clothes.¹⁴⁶ In 1513, Peter of Spišský Hrhov protested before the judicatory of the Spiš County, that the villeins of Francis of Brezovica from the village of Blažov, therefore meaning Wallachians, had pastured their sheep without authorization in the woods and meadows of Nižné Repáše. As a result he confiscated them, but armed Wallachians with their landlord came to Repáše at night and took away not only their own, but also the animals of the inhabitants, one of whom was injured.¹⁴⁷ In 1480, when the judicatory of the Šariš

¹³⁹ ŠA Prešov, Archív rodu Uz z Uzoviec, fasc. XLVII, no. 18: „Kyshennyng.“

¹⁴⁰ S. A. Sroka, ed. *Dokumenty polskie z archiwów dawnego królestwa Węgier*. Vol. 2. (*Dokumenty z lat 1451–1480*). [Polish Documents from the Archives of the Former Kingdom of Hungary II. Documents from 1451–1480] Krakow 2000, 190–191, no. 297.

¹⁴¹ MOL Kamara, E 159, B. 1036, Regesta decimarum comitatus Sarosiensis, part 8: „Hennyng Rutteni.“

¹⁴² DL17110: „*totales porciones suas possessionarias in possessionibus... Langwan, in qua valahi commorantur.*“ Beňko, Ref. 30, 231. Uličný, Ref. 1, 167, 413.

¹⁴³ DL32690: „*Item Langnow dominorum de Brezeuiche [porte] VIII.*“ Uličný, Ref. 71, 166.

¹⁴⁴ MOL Kamara, E 159, B. 1036, Regesta decimarum comitatus Sarosiensis, part 8: „*Langno Rutteni.*“

¹⁴⁵ RegSlov II, 92–93, no. 167. Rábik, Ref. 6, 67.

¹⁴⁶ DL69070: „*quod nobilis Nicolaus de Brzyzowycz quibusdam diebus miserat propter suum currum ad Silnam ... cum igitur domum peragere voluissent... valachi de Balasswagasa... ipsum currum dicti exponentis ad libitum ipsorum cepissent.*“

¹⁴⁷ DL63886: „*certas greges et pecora ovium iobagionum... in possessione Balaswagas commorantium.*“

County investigated the excesses of Wallachians from Blažov, behind whom stood their landlord Stanislav of Brezovica, he was also accused of attacking on a public road a certain Wallachian from Tichý Potok, a serf of his relation Nicholas of Brezovica.¹⁴⁸

*

Tichý Potok with the original German name Stillbach first appeared in written sources only in the portal register from 1427.¹⁴⁹ It was a village founded under German law and here the original population was German. A source from 1519 gives the German name Friedrich for a recently deceased farmer from the village.¹⁵⁰ The Wallachian and ethnically Ruthenian population was also a secondary element here.

The penetration of Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants into the north-western part of Šariš and into the Lordship of Makovica is explained in more detail by a document from the deputy sheriffs and county officers in 1518, recording the story of the investigation of possession of the Čierný les forest in the surroundings of Lukov. They questioned various witnesses about these matters, especially Peter Kádar (cooper) from Lenartovo, a serf of Nicholas of Kapušany, who declared that the disputed forest was always used by the castellans of Kamenica, about which he allegedly had 40 years of knowledge. This was confirmed by Trochan from *Miastko (a vanished locality in the territory of Tylicz in Poland), which belonged to Muszyna Castle, and by Hrycko of Andrejovka, as well as by serfs from the Lordship of Makovica Ivan of Stebník and Prokop from Vyšný or Nižný Tvarožec and finally a certain Synka from Lukov.

However, the noteworthy part was the testimony of Jaczko Strizon from Snakov, who declared that fifty years before he had lived in Poland, but at that time he and others, undoubtedly also Wallachians came to the village of Malcov with their sheep and cattle. They settled in certain fields or woods belonging to this village. The inhabitants of Macov discovered them and wanted to drive them out. However, they finally reached agreement and the inhabitants of Malcov permitted them to settle in the territory of the village, but forbade them to go into the Čierny les forest because it was the property of the late Thomas of Torysa.¹⁵¹ There is no doubt that this was a matter of the Wallachian population, which settled in the territory of Malcov mainly in the older village of Snakov. It is also noteworthy that with the exception of Lenartov, only inhabitants of Wallachian

¹⁴⁸ Dl.69070: "*dum dictus Stanislaus de Brzywycz... reperit quendam valachium de Stelbach.*"

¹⁴⁹ Dl.32690: "*Item Stelbach dominorum de Berzeuice VIII.*" Uličný, Ref. 71, 328.

¹⁵⁰ Dl.69115: "*tres sessiones suas iobagionales... alteram condam Frederice dicti in Stelbah [!]*"

¹⁵¹ Dl.69106: "*Item Jaczko Strizon de Snako iobagio nobilis Johannis Bornemissa de Polyanka fasus fuisset, quomodo ipse in anno circa quinquaginta preterito... in regno Polonie moram habuisset, et extunc venerat cum aliis sociis suis cum pecoribus suis de Polonia ad campum sew ad silvam possessionis Malczo, ibique eosdem reperissent iobagiones egregii Nicolai de Kapy in eadem Malcza commorantes, ibique ipsos voluissent inde pellere cum pecoribus suis et tandem cum eisdem iobagionibus ipsi concordassent et sic ipsos quiete relinquissent*". At the time of collection of the portal tax in 1548, some inhabitants fled to Poland. MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2658, fol. 451.

and Ruthenian villages provided evidence, because it was they who had the most experience of migration in the forbidden areas. However, the document from 1518 allows us to more precisely date the larger scale arrival of Ruthenians not only in Snakov, but in the whole district, to the period around 1470. Ruthenian inhabitants also penetrated into other neighbouring settlements no later than this time. Apart from the villages mentioned in the document, these included Hrabské (partially), Venecia, Orlov, Starina, Údol and Bajerovce, as well as the villages in the Poprad valley of Plaveč and Plavnica. Only the village of Livov, first mentioned in writing in 1470¹⁵² must be regarded as a newly established Ruthenian settlement. All these villages are designated Ruthenian settlements in the only partly preserved tithe register of the County of Šariš from 1538, and tithes were not collected from them.¹⁵³

*

However, older information is available about the Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants of the villages of Andrejovka, Starina, Lukov and Venecia. We learn that in 1505 the Wallachian Vaško *Huertpč* bought the positions of the Wallachian hereditary mayors of Starina (*Starinska*) and Andrejovka (*Andrzejovka*) from the original hereditary mayors Peter and Andrew sons of Ivan Kruchlica.¹⁵⁴ In 1518, noblemen from Kamenica endeavored to settle the Wallachian Ichnath, originally from Venecia, in Lukov, but the noblemen from Kapušany, to whom he was subject, protested.¹⁵⁵ The Wallachians were already in Venecia in 1491, when one of them – David, together with associates, participated in an attack on the Polish village of Śnietnica.¹⁵⁶

The whole expedition, in which inhabitants of other villages also participated, was led by Andrew son of a man known as Lulow (Livov?), apparently a Ruthenian and an inhabitant of the Wallachian village of Hradisko.¹⁵⁷ However, a complaint from 1506 gives direct information about its Wallachian population. According to the complain the Wallachians and inhabitants of Hradisko pastured their cattle and sheep in woods outside the territory of the village.¹⁵⁸ We will also

¹⁵² Dl.86554: "*Lewo*." Beňko, Ref. 30, 233. There is still a hill in the surroundings of the village with the name "*Rusínov*" (bench mark 808). Čergov. *Turistická mapa* no. 104. Scale 1: 50,000. Marmanec: Vojenský kartografický ústav 1996.

¹⁵³ MOL Kamara, E 159, B. 1036, Regesta decimarum comitatus Sarosiensis de anno 1538, part 7-9: "*Rutteni sunt... non decimantur*."

¹⁵⁴ MOL Budapest, *Archivum Locumtenentiale, Limitarnea Hungarico-Polonica*, Nr. 92, Fasc. Q. Lad. XX, no. 3. The content of the document is preserved only in a copy from 1793. Beňko, Ref. 30, 216.

¹⁵⁵ Dl.69107: "*unum valachum Ichnath dictum de possessione Veneche... ad possessionem Luko ducere... fecisset*." Uličný, Ref. 71, 181, 417, 456.

¹⁵⁶ Sroka, Ref. 84, III, 185, no. 524: "*primo fuit David de Vanacia cum suis coadiutoribus*."

¹⁵⁷ Sroka, Ref. 84, III, 185, no. 524: "*item de Hradyszko Andreas filius dicti Lulow, qui ductor horum omnium fuit*."

¹⁵⁸ Dl.39855: "*valachi et iobagiones de Hradiscza*." Uličný, Ref. 71, 397. Hradisko appears in the urbaria from 1557 and 1606 with Ruthenian inhabitants. MOL Budapest, U et C, fasc. 4, nr. 48: "*Radiska*" (1557); fasc. 40, no. 38: "*Radiczka Rutheni*" (1606). The neigh-

comment that the territory of the County of Šariš in the Middle Ages already contained further villages under the name Voľa, namely Nižná and Vyšná Voľa and Jakubova Voľa, but these villages were the work of Polish founders and were also partly settled by Polish inhabitants. They were not Ruthenian settlements.¹⁵⁹

Finally, it is also necessary to especially mention the Ruthenian and Wallachian inhabitants of the County of Abov, although we do not have proof of more permanent settlements in the Middle Ages. The oldest Košice court book contains a record from 1394 that the burghers included a certain tinsmith "Walach",¹⁶⁰ but he could have been a man of Rumanian nationality actually from Wallachia. However, Wallachian and Ruthenian inhabitants already appeared in the surroundings of Košice in the fourteenth century. This is shown by a letter from Pope Boniface IX from 1402, by which the Pope endeavored to support the reconstruction of the burnt out Church of St. Elizabeth by granting indulgences for pilgrims according to the model of St. Mark's in Venice or the Porziuncola in Assisi. He also emphasized that various Wallachians and Ruthenians had converted to Roman Catholicism in the church at Košice.¹⁶¹

Some of these Wallachians and Ruthenians undoubtedly became burghers of Košice, as is shown by the case of Michael and Peter from Galicia, who appear as "conciues" in the oldest Košice town book from 1393–1405.¹⁶² In 1437 Wallachians

bouring village of Žatkovce also appears as Ruthenian in these urbaria, and it is possible that the Ruthenians also penetrated here at the same time as to Hradisko.

¹⁵⁹ Nižná and Vyšná Voľa were originally called Jakubova Poruba (in 1382 Jacabuagasa; ŠA Levoča, Andrassy KH, Fasc. 53, no. 15) and Petrova Poruba (in 1438 Petherwagasa; AMK, TA, Kalnaj-S, no. 21.) but when we have more detailed information in modern times about the ethnicity of the population, both settlements were Slovak. Other settlements were established by Polish founders in the immediate surroundings, including the present village of Poliakovce in the Lordship of Makovica (in 1415 Polyak; D1.10333) and the village of "Polyakvagasa" somewhere near Marhaň, documented in 1370 (G. Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*. Budae 1829–1844, IX/4, 252–253, no. 149). In the neighbouring village of Porúbka, we find an inhabitant with the ethnic name of "Georgius Polak" in 1572 (MOL Kamara, E 158, A. 2655, fol. 153). It was similar in the case of Jakubová Voľa in the valley of the Torysa (1315 nova villa... Iacobfolua; 1332 Jabobsdorf, 1352 Jacabuagasa; RegSlov 2: 23–24, no. 7 (1315); ŠA Levoča, SspK, Scrin IX, Fasc. 6 (1332); D1.68903 (1352), which only appears under the name Voľa in 1474 ("Wolyaiacabfalua" ŠA Prešov, Druget H, I-51). This indicates demographic and ethnic changes and shows that the village must have been settled by people of at least partly Polish origin under the new settlement conditions of the fifteenth century. The fact that the nearby vanished village of *Petrovenec in the territory of Dubovica had an inhabitant called Nicholas the Pole in 1432 is undoubtedly connected with this [Iványi, Ref. 69, 45, no. 247: "Nic Polonus de Petermezew"].

¹⁶⁰ O. R. Halaga, ed. *Acta iudiciaria civitatis Cassoviensis 1393–1405. Das älteste Kaschauer Stadtbuch*. [The oldest town judge book] München 1994, 61: "Walach platener." O. R. Halaga, *Počiatky Košíc a zrod metropoly*. [The Beginnings of Košice and the Birth of a Metropolis] Košice 1992, 258.

¹⁶¹ *Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia*. Vol. I/4. Budapest 2000, 26.

¹⁶² Halaga, *Acta iudiciaria*, Ref. 159, no. 242, 356, 540, 570, 710, 1062, 1172, 1173, 1235, 2384, 2836, 3444, 4493, 4628, 4650, 4801, 5257, 6098: "Michael de Galcz concivis noster."

were already wandering in the forests of the monastery of Jasov. The grazing of their cattle damaged the forests and the prior Stanislav accused the castellan of Turňa Castle of introducing them.¹⁶³ Two years later the same Wallachians were wandering in the surroundings of Smolník, where they attacked and robbed people. The monarch ordered the castellan of Turňa Stephen Šafár to take action against them.¹⁶⁴ However, there was no more permanent penetration of Wallachians and Ruthenians or establishment of settlements in the territory of the County of Abov in the Middle Ages.

In conclusion, it is possible to summarize that the Ruthenians penetrated into the territory of eastern Slovakia in two basic waves starting from the beginning of the fourteenth century. At first they provided population for the settlements established according to the principles of the then fashionable and rapidly spreading German law, but almost at the same time, Ruthenians with Wallachian organization appeared in eastern Slovakia. However, very few settlements with continuous occupation by this Wallachian population can be identified from the fourteenth century. The Wallachians of this time can be described more as a group leading a way of life without constant links to fixed settlements. They did not build their own settlements but moved into the territories of existing settlements and often migrated.

More permanent settlement of the Wallachian population in eastern Slovakia is documented only from the beginning of the fifteenth century, but it still applies that new Ruthenian inhabitants with Wallachian socio-legal organization usually settled in older abandoned settlements, which are securely known to have been originally founded according to German law. This was strongly connected with the generally declining state of settlement in eastern Slovakia, especially its northern part, as it can be documented already from the end of the fourteenth century. It was similar in the case of further waves of Ruthenian inhabitants in the Middle Ages. It was only in the sixteenth century, especially from its middle, that more substantial Ruthenian-Wallachian activity can be documented. This involved building of new settlements, which significantly changed the ethnic and religious character of this part of Slovakia. However, the situation in the lands of the Drugeth family, namely the Lordship of Humenné within the County of Zemplín is an exception. The Drugeths settled their lands with Wallachian elements already in the Middle Ages, but this was so characteristic for the territory, that villages in the lordship were designated Wallachian already in the Middle Ages and the Wallachian term *krajňa* was used in the administrative organization of the Zemplín County.

¹⁶³ V. Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku*. [The Wallachians in Slovakia] Praha 1947, note 22.

¹⁶⁴ Sz. L. Bártfai, ed. *Oklevéltár a gróf Csáky család történetéhez*. [Cartulary to the history of the Count Csáky family] Vol. I/1. Budapest 1919, 376-378.

Die russisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen vom Andrusower Vertrag 1667 bis zum „ewigen Frieden“ von 1686

BEÁTA VARGA



1648 brach in der Ukraine ein Volksaufstand gegen die polnische Herrschaft aus. Die Erhebung Bohdan Chmelnyckyjs gegen Polen führte bald zur Schaffung der „Kosakischen Ukraine“, die ein sehr wichtiger Faktor in der Neuordnung der politischen Kräfte in Osteuropa wurde. Die Kiewer, Bratzlawer und Tschernigower Woiwodschaften wurden für autonom erklärt, und in der Hauptstadt Tschigirin eine hetmanische administrative Organisation ausgebaut, die auch als Keim des selbstständigen ukrainischen Staates betrachtet werden kann. Das Dasein dieses Staates war eine soziale und völkische Erscheinung gekettet, die nur der ostslawischen Geschichte eigentümlich und in ihrer ausgeprägtesten Form an den Ufern des Dnjeprs beheimatet ist: das ukrainische *Kosakentum*.¹ Bohdan Chmelnyckyj gelang es, das ganze ukrainische Volk unter der Fahne des Saporogerheeres zu vereinigen. Doch auch ihm blieb die Erringung völliger Selbstständigkeit versagt. Sie scheiterte im wesentlichen an der Ungunst der außenpolitischen Lage, an der für das ukrainische Volk verhängnisvollen Nachbarschaft überlegener Mächte, in diesem Falle Polens, Moskaus und der Türkei, die alle territorial an der Ukraine interessiert waren und daher den Kosaken von vornherein die Möglichkeit nahmen, unbeeinflusst und unabhängig von außen den Aufbau eines neuen, eigenen Staatswesens durchzuführen.

Das Jahr 1654 können wir als einen Knotenpunkt der Geschichte betrachten, in dem sich die drei Staaten, die polnisch-litauische Rzeczpospolita, Rußland und die Ukraine begegneten. Die Ukraine versuchte ihre Eigenstaatlichkeit zu vertei-

¹ Die ukrainische Kosakenschaft erschien als neuer gesellschaftlich-politischer Faktor in der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts auf der Bühne der Geschichte. Unter ihren Mitgliedern waren die Vertreter jeder gesellschaftlichen Gruppe von den Leibeigenen bis zu den verarmten Kleinadeligen zu finden. V. Scserbak, *Ukrainszke kozacsztvo: formuvannya szocialnoho sztanu*. Kijiv 2006, S. 35–49.

digen, Polen die Ukraine als Kolonie wieder zu erobern und Rußland die Ukraine an das Zarenreich zu binden.²

Wer von diesen dreien hatte die besten Chancen?

Polen kam komplizierte außenpolitische Lage. Zuerst der Krieg gegen Chmelnyckyj, dann gegen das Schweden von Gustav-Adolf, wobei die gespannte Lage und die kriegerischen Auseinandersetzungen mit der Türkei sowieso fortdauer-ten.

Welche Trümpfe hatte Rußland im Kampf um die Ukraine? Nach der „Zeit der Wirren“ stabilisierte sich die gesellschaftlich-politische Lage Rußlands. Der Weg vom zentralistischen Ständestaat zur absoluten Monarchie konnte weiter beschritten werden. Moskaus Außenpolitik zielte auf eine territoriale Vergrößerung des Staates, die politische Ideologie auf das „Sammeln der russischen Länder.“ Von großem Interesse war hierfür die Ukraine.

Chmelnyckyj versuchte bereits 1648 Kontakte mit Moskau zu knüpfen,³ nicht nur zwecks militärischer Hilfe, sondern auch wegen der schlechten finanziellen Lage des „Kosakenstaates“,⁴ doch der Zar Alexej Mihajlowitsch zögerte mit der Antwort. Er wollte dennoch abwarten, um bei den Verhandlungen aus der Notlage der Ukraine zu profitieren. Im Donationsbrief vom 27. März 1654⁵ wurde das neue Verhältnis zwischen dem russischen Staat und den ukrainischen Gebieten festgelegt.

Die Initiative lag zunächst ganz bei Chmelnyckyj, aber nachdem durch den Akt von Perejaslaw die Unterstellung der Kosaken unter die „Hohe Hand“ des Zaren vollzogen war, das erst erwachende staatliche Eigenbewußtsein der Kosakenschaft einfach nicht gewachsen war. Weder in der Frage der Wojewoden⁶ noch auf dem Gebiet der Finanzen war es gelungen, die Selbstständigkeit der Ukraine mit der nötigen Klarheit in den Vordergrund zu stellen. Der Zar betrachtete diesen Vertrag als Einverleibung der Ukraine ins russische Reich.

Somit kann zwar der Hetmanstaat nicht auf eine Ebene mit anderen Mächten Osteuropas gestellt werden: er hat nie die volle Souveränität besessen.⁷

Die Interpretierung des *Perejaslawer Vertrags* ist ein bis heute diskutiertes Thema in der Geschichtsschreibung. Die überwiegende Zahl russischer Historiker⁸ sahen in diesem Vertrag eine Legitimierung der Moskauer Herrschaft über

² E. Bobkiewicz, *Wege und Irrwege der ukrainischen Befreiungspolitik*, Strassburg 1995, S. 33.

³ *Vosszozjegyinyenyije Ukraini sz Rosszijej – Dokumenti i materiali v trjoh tomah*. Moskau 1954, 2: S. 32–33.

⁴ „Isztorija russzko-ukrainszkih otnosenij v XVII-XVIII vekah – K 350-letiju Perejaszlavszkoj Radi,“ *Szbornyik Sztatyej* (2006), 4.

⁵ *Vosszozjegyinyenyije Ukraini*, 3: S. 567–570.

⁶ D.h. der Frage der Unabhängigkeit von der moskauischen Verwaltung.

⁷ Sonst hat er aber die wesentlichen Erfordernisse, die den Begriff des Staates ausmachen, ein fest umrissenes Territorium, ein Volk und dabei ein reiches kulturelles Eigenleben entwickelt.

⁸ S. Sergius, *Oroszország története*. [Geschichte Russlands] Uschhorod 1895, S. 260.; V. O. Kljucsevszkij, *Kursz russzkoj isztoriji* [Kurze russische Geschichte] Vol. 3. Moskau 1957,

die Ukraine „für alle Zeiten.“ Sie vertraten die Ansicht, daß die Ukraine mit Rußland durch Schicksalsfügung verbunden ist und daß sich die Mehrheit der Ukrainer von Moskau gar nicht trennen will. Die ukrainischen Historiker⁹ vermerkten, daß Chmelnyckys Diplomaten einem zweideutigen und unklaren Wortlaut des Vertrages zugestimmt haben.

Damals befand sich Chmelnyckyj in einer politischen Zwangslage und zudem, nicht die Verträge entscheiden über den Verlauf der Geschichte, sondern die Machtverhältnisse. Und diese waren für die Ukraine immer ungünstig. Solange Bohdan Chmelnyckyj noch als der charismatische Kopf des Staates galt, konnte man von einer Integrationsfunktion des Hetmans als Vertreter der Kosakenchaft mit gesamtukrainischer Verantwortung sprechen. Das von ukrainischen Gebieten ausgebildete Hetmanat – mit Chmelnyckyj an der Spitze – verfügte über eine ausgebreitete Selbstverwaltung. Die eigene amtliche Benennung des ukrainischen Hetmanates wurde Saporoger Heer, mit diesen Namen bezeichnete er die militärische Organisation und zugleich den Staat. Die Anzahl der registrierten Kosaken im russischen staatlichen Dienst wurde in 60 tausend Personen maximiert, die berechtigt waren, ihre eigenen Leiter zu wählen. Der Hetman erhielt Vollmacht in innenpolitischen Fragen, und sein Wirkungskreis in auswärtigen Angelegenheiten wurde nur derart beschränkt, daß er Verhandlungen mit den ärgsten Feinden der russischen Regierung nur mit Zustimmung des Zaren durchführen konnte.

Der von Bohdan Chmelnyckyj geschaffene ukrainische Kosakenstaat konnte seine verhältnismäßige politische Unabhängigkeit und Integrität nicht lange aufrechterhalten. Der vorzeitige Tod Chmelnyckys, die schwierige Lage der Ukraine zwischen drei mächtigen Reichen – Moskowien, Polen und Türkei, die sämtlich ihre Rechte auf die Ukraine geltend machten, hauptsächlich aber die scharfen sozialen Gegensätze, die gleich nach dem Tode des großen Hetmans (1657) zum Vorschein kamen – all das machte dem ukrainischen Hetmanat viele Sorgen.¹⁰

Die Probleme stellten sich nun anders als früher: die Kosakenführer stritten darüber, ob die Ukraine unter der Oberherrschaft Moskaus bleiben oder sich unter den Schutz einer anderen Nachbarmacht stellen sollte. Nach Chmelnyckys Tod stritten ukrainische Hetmane um die Macht, nicht selten von polnischen, türkischen und russischen Interventionen unterstützt. In der ukrainischen Historiographie wird diese tragische Zeit als der „Ruin“ bezeichnet.

Der Tod Bohdan Chmelnyckys bedeutete eine Wendung in der Geschichte der Ukraine. Sein Werk blieb unvollendet. In der Absicht, ein ukrainisches Erbhetmanat zu gründen, bestimmte er seinen Sohn Jurij zum Nachfolger, der ein

S. 113; S. F. Platonov, *Oroszország története*. [Geschichte Russlands] Budapest 1936, S. 225.

⁹ N. I. Kosztomarov, *Isztoricszeszkaja monografija Bogdana Hmelnickogo*. 3 vols. Sankt Petersburg 1884, 3: S. 169. ; D. I. Evarnickij, *Isztorija Zaporozsszkij kozakov*. 3 vols. Sankt Petersburg 1895, 2: S. 248; M. Hruschewskij, *Die ukrainische Frage in historischer Entwicklung*. Wien 1915, S. 38.

¹⁰ F. E. Sysyn, „The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel’nyts’kyj Uprising,“ *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 46:4 (1998), 545.

„kranker und unreifer Jüngling war.“¹¹ Wenn auch die Autorität des verstorbenen Hetmans sehr groß war, so erlaubte doch die unsichere Lage der Ukraine in wichtigen Fragen der Staatsführung kein Experimentieren. Nachfolger von Bohdan Chmelnyckyj war zwei Monate lang sein Sohn Jurij, den *Iwan Wyhowskyj* – nachdem er die Unterstützung der meisten kosakischen Leiter erworben hatte – von der Macht entfernte. Seine Politik in der ersten Zeit seiner Regierung kann man als eine direkte Fortsetzung der Politik seines Vorgängers bezeichnen. Indem er die Verbindung mit Moskau aufrechterhielt und jede gewaltsame Auseinandersetzung mit den Zaren zu verhindern suchte, ließ er sich zugleich von der Idee eines mächtigen, unabhängigen ukrainischen Staates nicht abbringen.

Zwei wichtige Voraussetzungen waren für das Gelingen der Politik Wyhowskyjs maßgebend: die Einigkeit der Ukraine und die Nichteinmischung Moskaus. Beides traf nicht zu. Moskau zeigte ebenso wie zur Zeit Bohdan Chmelnyckys eine sehr zweideutige Haltung. Von Anfang an bemühte sich die Moskauer Diplomatie um eine größere Abhängigkeit der Ukraine vom Zaren. Nach dem Tode des alten Hetmans forderte der Zar nicht nur die Beschränkung der Zahl der Kosaken von 60.000 auf 40.000, sondern auch die Abhängigkeit des Kiewer Metropoliten vom Moskauer Patriarchen, wodurch die ukrainische orthodoxe Kirche, bis jetzt nur dem Patriarchen von Konstantinopel verantwortlich, ihrer Selbstständigkeit beraubt worden wäre.¹²

Wyhowskyj machte den Versuch, in den polnischen Staatsverband in Form einer Föderation Polens, Litauens und der Ukraine mit ausgedehnter Selbstständigkeit eines jeden der drei Mitglieder zurückzukehren. Auf Grund des *Vertrags von Hadjatsch*¹³ 1658 stellte der gemeinsame König die Verbindung zwischen diesen autonomen Bundesgliedern her. Der freie ukrainische Staat, der den Namen „Großfürstentum Rusj“ tragen sollte, erhielt die Territorialgrenzen im Rahmen der früheren Wojewodschaften Kiew, Tschernigow und Bratzlaw. Bald zeigte es sich jedoch, daß der Vertrag von Hadjatsch nur auf schwachen Füßen stand. Denn weder die Polen, noch die Massen der Ukrainer waren mit ihm zufrieden. Doch stieß der Vertrag auch auf den Widerstand den einfachen Kosaken und Volksmassen. Die frühere polnische Herrenwirtschaft stand dem Volke noch in allzufrischer Erinnerung.

Der schwache *Jurij Chmelnyckyj* tauchte jetzt als Gegenkandidat auf und wurde in Perejaslaw im Oktober 1659 vom Kosakenrat und von Vertretern Moskaus als Hetman anerkannt. Aber die Orientierung der Ukraine nach Moskau war nicht von langer Dauer. Daran trug Moskau selbst Schuld: die Vertreter des Zaren stellten bei der Wahl Jurij's Bedingungen, die von der ukrainischen Seite als verletzend empfunden wurden.¹⁴ Die Zarenregierung gab die sogenannten *Pere-*

¹¹ B. Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine*. Wiesbaden 1963, S. 106.

¹² S. Gebei, „Nagyhatalmak vetékedése Ukrajnáért a XVII. század második felében,“ in *Emberek és eszmék – Tanulmánykötet Vadász Sándor 70. évfordulójára*, Eger 2001, S. 194.

¹³ D. N. Bantis-Kamenszkij, *Isztorija Maloj Rossziji*. Sankt Petersburg 1903, S. 147.

¹⁴ Der Hetman durfte nicht mehr ohne Verständigung mit Moskau abgesetzt werden; in Perejaslaw, Nishyn, Tschernigow, Bratzlaw und Umanj sollten Wojewoden eingesetzt

jaslawer Artikel aus, die eindeutig dem Ziel dienten, in der Zukunft die eventuellen ukrainischen Verselbstigungsbestrebungen zu vermindern und die autonome Einrichtung der Ukraine einzuschränken.¹⁵ Der Vertrag,¹⁶ der auf dieser Grundlage in Anwesenheit der 40.000 Mann starken zaristischen Armee zustande kam, rief in der Ukraine allgemeine Unzufriedenheit hervor. Jurij Chmelnyckyj ging im entscheidenden Augenblick mit allem seinen kosakischen Regimentern zu den Polen über.¹⁷

In der Ukraine begann ein neuer Kampf: die eine Partei wünschte ein Bündnis mit Moskau, die andere neigte zu Polen. Allmählich bildete sich ein Zustand heraus, der einer Auflösung der Gesamtkraine gleichkam. In einer solchen Lage konnten die links- und rechtsufrige Ukraine nicht lange zusammenbleiben. Nutznießer dieses inneren Auseinandergehens wurden die fremdnationalen Faktoren: in der linksufrigen Ukraine erlangte Moskau das Übergewicht, in der rechtsufrigen Polen.

Diese Entwicklung wurde durch die Schwäche der Ukraine, durch ihre innere Uneinigkeit bedingt. Der soziale Gegensatz, der sich allmählich zwischen der kosakischen Starschinenschaft und dem einfachen Volke herauszubilden begann, war wohl eine der wichtigsten Ursachen der ausgebrochenen Anarchie.¹⁸

Unter solchen Umständen konnte nur eine starke Persönlichkeit die Ukraine zur Einigkeit und der daraus hervorgehenden vollen Unabhängigkeit führen. Aber die Zeit war gerade für Politiker kleineren Formats, für mehr oder weniger gewissenlose Spekulanten, die auf der Unruhe des Volkes ihre Karriere aufbauten, günstig.

Im Jahre 1663 wurde *Iwan Brjuhoweckyj* zum Hetman gewählt und vom Zaren bestätigt. Seine Kandidatur, von der Saporoger Sitsch aufgestellt und von Moskau gebilligt, fand nicht die mindeste Unterstützung innerhalb der ukrainischen Starschinenschaft. Um seine Freundschaft vollkommen sicher zu sein, fuhr der Hetman im Herbst 1665 nach Moskau und legte die ukrainischen Rechte und Privilegien zu Füßen des Zaren nieder.¹⁹ Diese Zugeständnisse machten die admi-

und die ihnen beigegebenen Moskauer Militärabteilungen auf Kosten der Bevölkerung ernährt werden.

¹⁵ Die diplomatische Tätigkeit des Hetmans wurde vollkommen unter die Kontrolle des Zaren gezogen; dem Saporoger Heer wurde verboten, ohne die Genehmigung des russischen Herrschers Krieg zu führen; der Hetman konnte von seinem Amt nicht ohne Zulassung von Moskau entfernt werden und er hatte nicht mehr das Recht, kosakische Leiter zu ernennen oder zu entheben.

¹⁶ N. A. Markevics, *Isztorija Malorossziji*. Moskau 1842, 5: S. 187-197.

¹⁷ Zwischen Polen und der Ukraine wurde ein neuer Vertrag geschlossen, der eigentlich eine abgeschwächte Redaktion des Paktes von Hadjatsch darstellte.

¹⁸ Innerhalb des Kosakentums bildeten sich sozusagen zwei Strömungen aus: die der wohlhabenden Elemente, die eher mit der Obrigkeit zusammengingen und die ärmeren, proletarischen Kosaken, die für die obere Schicht keine freundlichen Gefühle hegten.

¹⁹ Ende 1665 wurde ein neuer Pakt zustande gebracht, der der zaristischen Regierung außerordentliche Rechte in der Ukraine einräumte. Der unmittelbaren Verwaltung der

nistrative und finanzielle Selbstständigkeit der Ukraine illusorisch: es blieben eigentlich nur die kosakischen Rechte und Privilegien übrig. Die russische und die ukrainische Regierung schlossen den *Moskauer Vertrag*,²⁰ der dem Zaren außerordentliche Rechte in der Ukraine sicherte. Von nun an gingen die ukrainische Steuern direkt in das Zarenschatzamt ein und von der ukrainischen Autonomie blieben nur die kosakischen Rechte und Privilegien.

Insbesondere erhob sich *Petro Doroschenko*, der Hetman der rechtsufrigen Ukraine (1665-1676), abermals für die Einheit und Unabhängigkeit der Ukraine. In ihm wurde der Ukraine noch einmal ein Mann von großem Format geschenkt.

Doroschenko „verdankte [...] seinen Aufstieg ebenso sehr seinen ungewöhnlichen Fähigkeiten und der stählernen Energie wie auch der Uneigennützigkeit, die ihn von allem anderen ukrainischen Führern besonders auszeichnete. Nicht der Egoismus, das Streben nach Glanz und Reichtum waren die Triebfeder seiner Tätigkeit, sondern die Sorge das Schicksal der Ukraine [...]“.²¹

Die Befreiung der Ukraine wollte er in zwei Etappen durchführen: erstens die Säuberung der rechtsufrigen Ukraine von den noch vorhandenen polnischen Besatzungen und zweitens die Einbeziehung auch der linksufrigen Ukraine in die Befreiungsaktion. Wie alle rechtsufrige Hetmane war Doroschenko am Anfang seiner Amtszeit propolnisch. Aber diese Einstellung änderte sich radikal, als die Ergebnislosigkeit der Kriegsaktionen den Zaren und den polnischen König zum Friedensschluß bewog. Im Zusammenhang mit dem Bündnis mit den Tataren wurde auch an ein türkisches Protektorat über die Ukraine gedacht.

Aber die anfänglichen Erfolge Doroschenkos und der Tataren gegen die polnischen Kriegsabteilungen veranlaßten die polnische Regierung zu einer Annäherung an Moskau. Die russische und die polnische Regierung schloss einen Friedensvertrag, der die Teilung der Ukraine realisierte. Der *Vertrag von Andrusowo* 1667²² beendete die polnisch-russischen Auseinandersetzungen und degradierte die Ukraine zu einem Objekt, das auf dem Kartentisch aufgeteilt wurde. Die beiden Mächte kamen überein, die Gebiete östlich des Dnjepr dem Moskauer Reich zuzuschlagen, Polen erhielt das westlich Gebiet des Dnjepr. Diesem Waffenstillstand zufolge sollte Kiew²³ für zwei Jahre unter der Herrschaft Moskaus

Moskauer Wojewoden wurden auch solche wichtigen Städte, wie Poltawa, Novhorod-Siwerskyj, Kremenschuch, Kodak, Oster unterstellt.

²⁰ D. N. Bantis-Kamenszchim, *Isztocsnjiki Malorosszijszkoj isztoriji, szobrannije*. Sankt Petersburg 1858, S. 8-9.

²¹ Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine*, S. 116.

²² *Akti, odnoszjaszieszja k isztoriji Zapadnoj Rossziji (Akti JUZR)*. Sankt Petersburg 1861-1869, S. 173-176.

²³ Besonderes Interesse widmete der Zar der Rolle Kiews, denn die auf dem Rechten Dnjepr-Ufer gelegene „Mutter der russischen Städte“ gehörte eigentlich zum polnisch verwalteten Gebiet. Man einigte sich darauf, die Stadt noch zwei weitere Jahre unter russischer Verwaltung zu belassen. Danach sollte sie an Polen fallen, doch dazu kam es nicht mehr.

bleiben und dann an Polen abgetreten werden, während die Saporoger Sitsch unter das Protektorat beider Staaten gestellt wurde.

Die Aufmerksamkeit beider Reiche richtete sich auf das Osmanische Reich, gegen das man sich gleichzeitig verbündet hatte. Die wichtiger erscheinenden Interessen dieser „Heiligen Liga“ lenkten vom Streit um eine einzelne, damals nur historisch bedeutsame Stadt ab.

Dieser Kompromiß bestimmte das Schicksal der Ukraine auf mehr als ein ganzes Jahrhundert. Der Zerfall der Ukraine in mehrere Herrschaftszentren, wovon sich eines unter Moskauer Herrschaft stellte, ein anderes am Rande der Steppe ein weitgehendes Eigenleben fortzuführen in der Lage war und schließlich die Westukraine, die im Vertrag von Andrusovo dem polnischen Reichsteil zugeschlagen wurde und selbst keinerlei kosakische Organisation mehr aufwies, bedeutete das Ende jenes Staates, das Bohdan Chmelnyckyj im Verlaufe des Aufstandes geschaffen hatte.

Nachdem Rußland und Polen die Ukraine untereinander aufgeteilt hatten, sollte es für fast dreihundert Jahre vorbei sein. Die Zugehörigkeit zu verschiedenen politischen Staaten und kulturellen Einflußspären begründete in der darauffolgenden Zeit auch Unterschiede zwischen den Ukrainern der verschiedenen Gebiete.²⁴

Rußland kontrollierte drei Territorien, die von Ukrainern bewohnt wurden. Vor 1648 war die linksufrige Ukraine als ein erst kurz zuvor kolonisiertes Land sehr dünn besiedelt. Weil hier aber ein autonomes, geordnetes Kosakenregierungs-system recht lange erhalten blieb und Flüchtlinge vom rechten Ufer anzog, wurde das linke Ufer zum Zentrum des ukrainischen politischen und kulturellen Lebens. In der ukrainischen Historiographie wird diese Region häufig als das Hetmanat bezeichnet.

In dem Maße, in dem die Hetmane ihre Autorität erweiterten, verlor das Gebiet der Saporoger Kosaken (Sitsch),²⁵ einst das Zentrum des Kosakenlebens, seine Bedeutung. Das Zaporozje stand seit 1667 im Dienst des Zaren und des Königs und gehörte seit 1686 völlig zu Moskau und war damit wenigstens formell dem Hetman unterstellt. Doch hatten die Saporoger weder für den Zaren noch für den Hetman viel übrig, sondern richteten ihr Augenmerk vornehmlich auf gute Beziehungen zum Sultan.

Staatsrechtlich gesehen lag das weite Land um die heutige Stadt Charkiw herum innerhalb der Grenzen Rußlands. Um die Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts wurde dort eine autonome Selbstverwaltung im Kosakenstil errichtet. Da der Zuzug mit Freiungen (slobody) gefördert wurde, bürgerte etablierte sich die Bezeichnung Sloboda-Ukraine für dieses Teilgebiet.

²⁴ I. Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy – Nationalism and leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine*. New York 1988, 303–304.

²⁵ In den 1540er Jahren siedelten die „freien“ Kosaken sich an den Wasserstürzen des Dnieprs nieder, wo sie ihren „Kampfstaat“, d. h. Saporoger Sitsch gründeten. A. Schmidt, *Ukraine. Land der Zukunft*. Berlin 1936, S. 36.

Schon der Vertrag von Andrusovo, der dann 1686 in einen ewigen Frieden umgewandelt wurde, brachte die rechtsufrige Ukraine²⁶ mit Ausnahme von Kiew wieder an Polen, wo sie, wenn auch nicht kampflös und unbestritten, bis zur zweiten Teilung Polens von 1793 verblieb.

Einzig und allein die linksufrige Ukraine, das Hetmanat im engeren Sinne, wenn auch im Verbande mit Rußland, bewahrte eine in Rechnung zu stellende politische Größe und eine im 17. Jahrhundert stark geschmälerte innere Autonomie von selbstständig staatlichem Gepräge. Kleinrußland, wie dieses Land sowohl von großrussischer Seite genannt wurde – die offizielle Bezeichnung war „Vojsko Zaporozsszkoje“ –, bedeckte etwa die Fläche der späteren Gouvernements Poltava und Tschernihiw.

Seiner Gliederung und seinem Aufbau nach war der Hetmanstaat eine Weiterbildung der militärischgenossenschaftlichen Organisationsformen, die sich innerhalb der Saporoger Sitsch im 16. Jahrhundert herausgebildet hatten.²⁷ Seit der Aufstand von 1648 hatten sie schließlich die Aufgaben voller staatlicher Organe zu erfüllen.

Die Kosaken schufen ihre spezifische Verwaltungsform. Das Territorium, das sie kontrollierten, wurde in militärische Distrikte (Polky) aufgeteilt, die den Regimentern²⁸ der Kosakenarmee entsprachen. Jeder Regimentsdistrikt war weiter in Kompanien (Hundertschaften) gegliedert, in denen Hauptleute militärische und administrative Funktionen ausübten. Sowohl Regimenter als auch Kompanien hatten ihre Hauptquartiere in den Hauptstädten der jeweiligen Gebiete und trugen deren Namen. Die unterste Verwaltungseinheit waren kleine Städte und Dörfer, in denen Kosaken-Atamane herrschten. Ursprünglich waren die Kosakenoffiziere durch die Kosaken ihrer jeweiligen Einheiten gewählt worden, im Laufe der Zeit wurden diese mit Ämtern verbundenen Stellungen jedoch erblich.

An der Spitze dieses militärischen und administrativen Systems stand der „Hetman des Saporogerheeres“ oder wie der vollere Titel in Hinblick auf die Oberhoheit des Zaren lautete, „Seiner Erlauchten Zarischen Majestät Hetman des Saporogerheeres beider Ufer des Dnjeprs“. Der Hetman wurde, zum wenigsten

²⁶ Der polnische Adelsstaat beherrschte das Land westlich des Dnjepr, wobei hier zwei sozial differenzierte Gebiete zu unterscheiden wären. Die Wojewodschaften Kiew, Braclaw, Wolhynien und Podolien rechts des Dnjepr hatten unter dem Aufstand von 1648 den wiederholten polnischen, osmanischen, tatarischen und russischen Einfällen der Ruina-Zeit am meisten gelitten. Die westukrainischen Gebiete Galizien und Polesien, die Wojewodschaften Rusj und Belz, waren schon lange dicht besiedelt und besaßen eine gefestigte Adelschicht. Der Einfluss der nahen Kerngebiete Polens war hier am größten. Die übrigen Gebiete im Westen wurden durch Ungarn und Türken beherrscht. Seit 1672 hielten die Osmanen den größten Teil Podoliens besetzt, erst im Jahre 1699 wurde dieses Gebiet Polen zurückgegeben.

²⁷ C. Kumke, *Führer und Geführte bei den Saporoger Kosaken*. Wiesbaden 1993, S. 61.

²⁸ Der Hetmanat zählte um 1654 sieben, unter Bohdan Chmelnyckyjs Nachfolgern dann im ganzen folgenden zehn Regimentern.

formell, vom Heeresrat²⁹ gewählt und mußte dem Kosakenstand angehören. Aber das rasche Anwachsen der Kosakenzahl in der Zeit von 1648 bis 1656 erschwerte die Arbeit dieser allgemeinen Räte, und die Hetmane beriefen sie nur selten ein.

Dreifach waren somit die Bindungen der Macht des Hetmans: rechtlich an die Kosakenschaft, die ihn gewählt hatte und wieder stürzen konnte, sowie an den Zaren, dem er Treue geschworen, persönlich an die ukrainische hohe Geistlichkeit, deren Einfluß auf die Geschicke des Hetmanats zuweilen sehr bedeutend war.³⁰

In der Praxis allerdings waren die Hetmane frei, ihre umfassenden Vorrechte auszuüben, und de facto waren sie die Herrscher des ihnen unterstellten Teiles der Ukraine. Der Hetman führte das Kosakenheer, er besaß entscheidenden Einfluß auf die Besetzung der hohen Ämter, er war der oberste Richter, er berief die Räte, verwaltete die Heereskasse und vergab Heeresland an die Kosakenherrschaft. Im übrigen war die Machtstellung des Hetmans auch im 17. Jahrhundert nicht eindeutig fest und unbestritten, sondern oft äußersten Schwankungen im Spiel der innen- und außenpolitischen Kräfte ausgesetzt. Selbst wenn er zuweilen die Befehlsgewalt eines wahren Fürsten und im Kriege manchmal diktatorische Vollmachten besaß, war der Hetman doch kein absoluter Regent, sondern, dem demokratischen Wesen des Kosakentums entsprechend, an den Willen des Heeres gebunden.

Denn in der Natur des Hetmanats lag die Bildung einer starken Zentralgewalt, in der Natur des Ältestenrates (Starschina Rada)³¹ und der Starschina aber lag das gerade entgegengesetzte Ziel eines oligarchisch regierten Staatswesens. So kam es denn nicht selten zu heftigen Zusammenstößen.

Der Hetman war nicht nur Führer des Saporogerheeres, sondern darüber hinaus Regent³² und Vertreter des ganzen ukrainischen Landes nach innen und außen und wurde als solcher auch von Moskau praktisch anerkannt. In seiner Person wurde die Vereinigung von Rußland und der Ukraine erst wirksam, über ihn und durch ihn herrschte der Zar.

²⁹ Der Heeresrat kam nach 1654 nur noch aus bedeutsamen Anlässen, in der Regel zur Neuwahl eines Hetmans und zur Abschließung der bei dieser Gelegenheit stets erneuerten und ergänzten Artikel zwischen Moskau und dem Saporogerheer zusammen. Die Zuständigkeit des Heeresrates erstreckte sich auf alle den Staat und die Kosakenschaft betreffenden Fragen, sei es politischer, wirtschaftlicher oder rechtlicher Art. Im 18. Jahrhundert verlor der Heeresrat vollend jegliche Bedeutung und diente nur noch in Form von glänzenden Paraden zur feierlichen und dekorativen Umrahmung prächtig aufgezogener Hetmanswahlen.

³⁰ H. Schumann, *Der Hetmanstaat, (1654–1764)*. Breslau 1936, S. 526.

³¹ Im Ältestenrat war die Kosakenführerschaft vertreten, die Obersten und ihre Stäbe bis zum Hundertschaftsführer. Alle wichtigen, die Verwaltung des ganzen Landes angehenden Fragen wurden hier vorberaten und vorweggenommen. Zu den besonderen Rechten des Ältestenrates gehörte auch die Hinzuziehung zu Verhandlungen mit den Vertretern auswärtiger Mächte sowie mit den Abgesandten des Zaren.

³² M. Hruschewskyj, *Istorijsja Ukrajinjy-Rusy*. Bd. VIII. Teil 3. Kiew-Wien 1922, S. 284.

Die Aufteilung der Ukraine wurde von der gesamten Bevölkerung als ein Verrat am Verträge von Perejaslaw angesehen. Aus Furcht vor einem Aufstand änderte Iwan Brjuhoweckyj seine Orientierung und berief 1668 den Ältestenrat. Er erklärte, der einzige Ausweg liege darin, die moskowitischen Wojewoden zu vertreiben und bei der Türkei Schutz zu suchen. So reisten Abgesandte nach Konstantinopel mit dem Vorschlag einer Untertanenschaft der Ukraine unter den Bedingungen einer Vasallität, was vom Sultan akzeptiert wurde. Brjuhoweckyj blieb als Vasall in Kiew, der Krimkhan schickte Tataren zu Hilfe und begann einen Aufstand gegen Moskau.

Gerade die zaristische Regierung fühlte damals das Bedürfnis, sich mit Petro Doroschenko zu verständigen: die Unzufriedenheit der Volksmassen der linksufrigen Ukraine mit Moskau, die fallenden Chancen Brjuhoweckys und die steigende Popularität Doroschenkos kündigten eine Umwälzung an, der die zaristische Diplomatie vorzubeugen suchte. Aber die Bedingungen Doroschenkos waren sehr weitgehend: für seine Anerkennung des Moskauer Protektorats verlangte er entgegen dem Andrusower Vertrag die Vereinigung der linksufrigen Ukraine mit der rechtsufrigen unter seinem Hetmanat, die Militärhilfe Moskaus für die Angliederung an den Hetmanstaat der noch Polen zugehörnden westlichen ukrainischen Territorien und Räumung der linksufrigen Ukraine von den dort anwesenden Moskauer Wojewoden.³³ Dem Zaren waren diese Forderungen zu hoch und er zog es vor, bei der Andrusower Teilung zu verbleiben, anstatt in Gemeinschaft mit Doroschenko einen neuen Krieg gegen Polen zu führen.

Die Unabhängigkeit der Ukraine zu erringen, versuchte Doroschenko andere Bündniskombinationen. Er gab seine polenfreundliche Haltung und unterstellte die Ukraine der osmanischen Oberhoheit. Dann führte er Truppen in die linksufrige Ukraine, wo er vom ganzen Volke erwartet und begrüßt wurde. Sein Erscheinen wirkte wie ein Signal zur Abrechnung mit Brjuhoweckyj, der getötet wurde. 1668 war Doroschenko auf dem Höhepunkt seiner Macht angelagt. Gestützt von den Osmanen konnte sich der Herrscher sowohl über die rechtsufrige als auch über die linksufrige Ukraine zum Hetman der gesamten Ukraine proklamieren.

Sein Erfolg war jedoch nur flüchtig: seine zunehmende Macht mobilisierte zahlreiche Feinde. Gerade seine Popularität und seine Stärke erschreckte die beiden Nachbarn, Polen und Moskau. Als er noch seine höchsten Triumphe in der linksufrigen Ukraine feierte, erreichte ihn die Nachricht, daß das polnische Heer seine Abwesenheit benutzt hatte, in die rechtsufrige Ukraine einzudringen. Um die Abwehr zu organisieren, eilte Doroschenko in seine Residenz Tschichirin und ließ die linksufrige Ukraine unter der Verwaltung seines Stellvertreters, *Demjan Mnohohrysnjy* zurück.

Seine Abreise benutzte nun Moskau, in die Verhältnisse der linksufrigen Ukraine tätig einzugreifen. Die Lage Mnohohrysnys, der ohne genügende Hilfsmittel belassen wurde, gestaltete sich sehr schwierig. Aus Furcht vor der Rache des Zaren herrschte hier in der Nähe der Moskauer Grenze eine ausgesprochene

³³ Akti JUZR IX. 218–220.

Kompromißstimmung. Mnohohrysnij erklärte seine Bereitwilligkeit, das Moskauer Protektorat anzuerkennen und wurde im März 1669 in Gluchow zum Hetman gewählt.

Aber der *Gluchower Vertrag*, der hier mit Moskau vereinbart wurde, befriedigte lange nicht die Wünsche der ukrainischen Seite: selbstständige diplomatische Beziehungen mit dem Auslande wurden dem Hetman nicht gestattet und die Zahl des Kosakenheeres wurde auf 30.000 festgesetzt.³⁴

Die oft unvorsichtigen Äusserungen Mnohohrysnij's und insbesondere seine freundlichen, aber durchaus unverdächtigen Beziehungen zu Doroschenko wurden als Verrat, als Bestreben, die Ukraine unter das türkische Protektorat zu bringen.³⁵ Seiner Amtszeit folgte eine dreimonatige Regierung der Offiziersoligarchie, die bestrebt war, die Macht des nächsten Hetmans einzuschränken. Im März 1672 erfolgte die Palastrevolution: ganz unerwartet wurde Monohohrysnij in der Nacht in seinem eigenen Heim zu Baturyn von den Verschwörern ergriffen und Moskau ausgeliefert.

Der Nachfolger Mnohohrysnij's war *Iwan Samojlowitsch* (1672–1687). In den vereinbarten Vertragspunkten wurde die Macht des Hetmans neuerdings eingeschränkt, was den Wünschen Moskaus besonders entsprach.³⁶

Die Artikel von Konotop³⁷ (1672) enthielten eine Reihe von Bestimmungen, die die Befugnisse des Hetmans zu Gunsten der Starschina einschränkten. Es wurde festgelegt, daß der Hetman ohne ihren Spruch niemanden von ihnen richten oder bestrafen und ohne ihren Rat – sowie ohne zarischen Ukaz – keinen schriftlichen oder gesandtschaftlichen Verkehr mit anderen Monarchen unterhalten dürfe. Diese Einschränkungen waren im Grunde aber schon erfolgt, nur nicht im Sinne der Starschina, sondern im Sinne der Moskauer Regierung, sodaß sich bei dem offenen Machtverfall des Hetmanats eine ständische Opposition nur noch gegen den Zaren selbst regen könnte.

Der neue Hetman war ein umfassend gebildeter Mensch, ein talantierter Politiker und zweifellos ein Patriot,³⁸ der eine unabhängige Ukraine wünschte und in jener Zeit geschickt mit Moskau umging. Nach der Verdrängung Mnohohrysnij's stellte die Starschina bei der Wahl von Samojlowitsch eine Reihe von Forderungen auf, um die Macht des Hetmans einzudämmen. Sie wurden von Hetman akzeptiert und es erfolgte eine Politik nach den Vorstellungen der Offiziere, indem er dem Staat einen aristokratischen Charakter verlieh. Er berief keine Generalversammlungen ein und beriet alle Angelegenheiten mit dem Rat der Starschina, ferner schuf er gewisse Eliteeinheiten hauptsächlich für die Söhne derjenigen Offiziere, die in seiner nächsten Umgebung waren. Während seiner 15jährigen Amtszeit bildete sich ein Hetmanstaat mit monarchistischem Charakter heraus.

³⁴ N. I. Kosztomarov, *Isztoricseszkaja monografija Bogdana Hmelnyickowo*. Sankt Petersburg 1884, 3: S. 144.

³⁵ Akti JUZR IX. S. 836–837.

³⁶ N. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Geschichte der Ukraine*. München 1923, S. 403.

³⁷ Bantis-Kamenszkij, *Isztocsnyiki Malorosszijszkoi*, S. 258–259.

³⁸ Polonska-Vasylenko, *Geschichte der Ukraine*, S. 408.

Während sich die Entwicklung der gemeinen Kosakensschaft in fallender Kurve bewegte, war es der Starschina vergönnt, ihre wirtschaftlichen und innenpolitischen Wünsche zu verwirklichen. Es wurde bereits die Spannung erwähnt, die sich zwischen ihr und dem Hetman zwangsläufig ergeben mußte. Die entscheidenden Auseinandersetzungen um das politische Übergewicht fielen in die Regierungszeiten von Mnohohrysnj und Samojlowitsch und endeten mit dem vollen Siege der Starschina. Allerdings wurde dieser Sieg mit einer in starkem Masse selbst verschuldeten Minderung der innerstaatlichen Autonomie zu Gunsten Moskaus bezahlt.³⁹

Eine der wichtigsten Aufgaben, die sich der neue Hetman stellte, war die Vereinigung aller ukrainischen Länder. Er bekämpfte auch die Tendenz des Saporoger Sitsch zur Verfolgung einer eigenen Politik. Seinen Plänen stand aber der auf die Türkei orientierte Doroschenko im Wege. So mußte zunächst der Hetman der rechtsufrigen Ukraine beseitigt werden, worauf Samojlowitsch seine ganze Energie konzentrierte. Hier waren aber große Schwierigkeiten zu überwinden, denn die Moskauer Regierung war vorläufig anderer Auffassung. Auch für sie war der türkisch-polnische Krieg von 1672 und der Friede von Butschatsch ein großes Ereignis.⁴⁰ Die Machtsphären Moskaus und der Türkei berührten sich jetzt am Flusse Dnjepr, der Grenzscheide zwischen der rechtsufrigen, unter dem türkischen Protektorat stehenden Ukraine und dem von Moskau kontrollierten Hetmanatsgebiet. Diese gefährliche Annäherung veranlaßte Moskau neben großen Rüstungen zu dem Versuch, die rechtsufrige Ukraine auf dem Wege der Verständigung mit Doroschenko dem türkischen Einfluß zu entziehen. Aber die Verhandlungen erwiesen bald, das sich Doroschenko immer noch an Bedingungen von etwa 1668 festhielt, die die Moskauer Regierung viel zu hoch dünkten.

Erst nach dieser Klarstellung zeigte sich Moskau geneigt, der Auffassung Samojlowitschs zuzustimmen. Mit großem Nachdruck stellte er die These auf, daß nur der Krieg gegen Doroschenko und die Besitznahme der rechtsufrigen Ukraine zugunsten des linksufrigen Hetmanats die türkische Gefahr bannen könnte. Gerade die Zeit der polnisch-türkischen Auseinandersetzung benutzend, überschritten schon zu Anfang 1674 die vereinigten Armeen Samojlowitschs und des Moskauer Wojewoden Romodanowskyj den Dnjepr und begannen die rechtsufrige Ukraine zu okkupieren, ohne ernstlichen Widerstand zu finden. In etwa zwei Monaten war beinahe das ganze Land besetzt. Schon im März 1674 wurde Samojlowitsch in Perejeslaw zum „Hetman zu beiden Seiten des Dnieprs“⁴¹ d.h. die Gesamtukraine ausgerufen.

³⁹ Der Sturz Mnohohrysnys und Samojlowitsch', die von ihren General-Ältesten dem Zaren ausgeliefert wurden, mit der Bitte, sie als Vertreter hinzurichten, war ein trauriges und beschämendes Kapitel in der Geschichte des Hetmanstaates. Bantis-Kamen-szkij, *Isztorija Maloj Rossziji*, 2: S. 286.

⁴⁰ Im Oktober 1672 wurde ein Vertrag unterzeichnet, in dem Polen auf den Besitz der rechtsufrigen Ukraine Verzicht leistete. Ein großer Teil Podoliens ging in unmittelbaren türkischen Besitz über; die Wojewodschaften Braclaw und Kiew wurden unter türkischen Protektorat überlassen.

⁴¹ Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine*, S. 126.

Aber der Triumph Samojlowitschs dauerte nicht lange. Bald erfuhr auch der Sultan von der bedrängten Lage Doroschenkos. Von zwei Seiten begann nun das Werk der Wiederbesetzung der rechtsufrigen Ukraine: von Osten aus operierte Doroschenko mit dem Krimkhan, von Südwesten aus die türkische Armee. Der Bevölkerung bemächtigte sich eine schreckhafte, panikartige Stimmung. Die Massen verliessen ihre Heimstätten, um in der linksufrigen Ukraine Rettung zu suchen. Wegen seines Bundes mit den verhassten Ungläubigen, den Osmanen, schwand Doroschenkos Popularität bei seinen Gefolgsleuten. Das Ende kam, als 1675/76 die Russen, von den linksufrigen Kosaken unterstützt, gegen die Osmanen in den Kampf um die Festung Tschichirin zogen. Noch einige Zeit gelang es Doroschenko, die Oberhand zu behalten, aber schließlich machte ihn die unzuverlässige Haltung seiner einzigen Stütze, der türkisch-tatarischen Bundesgenossen, mutlos. So knüpfte er Verhandlungen mit Samojlowitsch und Moskau zwecks Übergabe seiner Herrschaftsrechte an. Schwer war es für ihn, auf sein Lebensziel verzichten zu müssen, und erst im September 1676 legte er endgültig seine Hetmansbulawa zugunsten Samojlowitschs nieder.⁴² Mit Doroschenko trat eine der bezeichnendsten Persönlichkeiten der Zeit der Irrungen und Wirrungen von der politischen Bühne der Ukraine.⁴³ Trotz allem Elend, das seine Aktion im Endresultat herbeigeführt hat, sieht in ihm die ukrainische Historiographie eine durchaus positive, starke und bei besserem Glück zur Fundierung der geeinten Ukraine vor allen anderen Politikern seiner Zeit am besten geeignete Persönlichkeit.

An Doroschenkos Stelle setzten die Osmanen 1677 wieder *Jurij Chmelnyckyj* als Hetman der rechtsufrigen Ukraine ein. Aber nach vier Jahren einer ineffektiven Herrschaft verloren sie die Geduld mit ihrer Marionette und setzten ihn wieder ab. 1681 schloß Rußland mit den Osmanen und den Krimtataren den Frieden von Bachtschisaraj, in dem die Parteien ihre gegenseitigen Besitzungen in der Ukraine anerkannten.

Die Meinungsverschiedenheiten zwischen Samojlowitsch und dem Zaren wurden durch die moskowitzische Krimpolitik hervorgerufen. Zu Beginn der 1680er Jahre begannen Österreich, Venedig, Polen, der Vatikan und Moskau mit der Bildung einer Koalition gegen die Türken und somit auch gegen die Krim. Es wurde auch ein Vertreter der Ukraine eingeladen, aber Samojlowitsch verzichtete auf eine Beteiligung an der „Heiligen Liga“. Er befürchtete, daß eine Vernichtung des Tatarenkhanats dem weiteren Verlauf der Dinge in Hinsicht auf die Unabhängigkeit der Ukraine schaden würde, die in diesem Fall vom moskowitzischen Herrschaftsbereich umschlossen wäre. Samojlowitsch war überhaupt gegen eine Annäherung Moskaus und Polens und warnte den Zaren hinsichtlich Polens. Entgegen den Vorstellungen des weitsichtigen Hetmans unterzeichneten Moskau und Polen 1686 den „ewigen Frieden“, wobei die linksufrige Ukraine mit Kiew unter die Herrschaft Moskaus kam.

⁴² Er lebte noch lange in Moskau in ehrenvoller Verbannung und beschloss hier sein Leben im Jahr 1698.

⁴³ Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine*, S. 127.

Der innere Zerfall der allein staatstragenden Gesellschaftschicht zog mit Notwendigkeit auch den Niedergang des Hetmanats nach sich und schuf so die Voraussetzungen für den Sieg, den Moskau im Kampf gegen die ukrainische Autonomie davongetragen hat. Es ist nicht zuviel behauptet, wenn man sagt, daß es einzig und allein die Uneinigkeit der Kosaken war, die es Moskau, zum wenigsten in den ersten beiden Jahrzehnten seiner Verbindung mit der Ukraine, überhaupt ermöglicht hat, seine Protektoratsstellung aufrecht zu erhalten.

Stets es gelang es, Herr der Lage zu werden, nicht so sehr aus eigener Kraft und Überlegenheit, als vielmehr mit Hilfe der uneinigen Kosakenschaft selbst, deren Reihen zu spalten Moskau immer mit Erfolg bemüht war. Dennoch erforderte der Kampf um die Ukraine die Anspannung aller seiner Kräfte und darin lag die historische Notwendigkeit, die der Besitz der Ukraine für die Entwicklung des Moskauer Staates besaß. Er gab in Moskau und Petersburg nun einmal keinen Raum für zwei Gewalten, und was den Kosaken Recht und Freiheit, das war dem Zaren Wortbruch und Verrat. So durchzieht die Geschichte der ukrainisch-russischen Beziehungen im Grunde eine Kette von Mißverständnissen, deren Lösung schließlich nur im Sinne einer machtpolitischen Entscheidung erfolgen konnte.

Das 17. Jahrhundert sah einen Hetmanstaat, der trotz zunehmender Einingung im großen und ganzen doch seine innere Selbstständigkeit und Eigenart bewahrte, das 18. Jahrhundert sah nur noch seinen stückweisen, unaufhaltsamen Zusammenbruch.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Was Peter der Große einleitete, führte Katharina zu Ende. Ohne Widerstand zu finden, zwang sie 1764 den Hetman Kirill Razumovszkij zur Abdankung, und fast ebenso widerstand vollzogen sich die weiteren Etappen auf diesem Wege: die Aufteilung der Hetmanat in drei Statthalterschaften (1781), die Auflösung des Kosakenheers und seine Eingliederung in die russische Armee (1783), die gesetzlich Einführung der Leibeigenschaft (1783) und die Übertragung der großrussischen Adelsverfassung (1785). Die Ukraine war eine Provinz des russischen Reiches geworden.

Oregon Politicians and Newspaper Editors of the Territorial Period

ANDREA KÖKÉNY



The Oregon Country consisted of the land north of 42° N latitude, south of 54°40'N latitude, and west of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. In the Anglo-American Convention of 1818 it was agreed that the 49th parallel would mark the boundary between Canada and the United States from Lake of the Woods in Minnesota to the Rocky Mountains. The two countries agreed to joint occupation of the land west of the Rockies to the Pacific Ocean.

The region was mostly occupied by British and French Canadian fur traders from the 1810s, but more and more Americans – Protestant and Catholic missionaries as well as settlers – started to arrive there from the mid-1830s. The settlement of Oregon began in earnest only with the Great Migration overland from the east in 1843. Oregon City was established as the first incorporated city west of the Rocky Mountains in 1844. By 1846 it had a population of five hundred.¹ It became evident to the leading pioneers of the community that the interests of the young settlement would be greatly promoted by a press. In 1845 they organized the Oregon Printing Association to establish the *Oregon Spectator*, the first newspaper published west of the Missouri river. According to George S. Turnbull the Association was “more or less the outgrowth of the Pioneer Lyceum and Literary Club founded in 1843.”² The printing press, type, and materials were owned by the Printing Association whose officers were W. G. T’Vault, president; J. W. Nesmith, vice president; John P. Brooks, secretary; George Abernethy, treasurer; Robert Newell, John E. Long, and John R. Couch, directors.³ With the exception of Couch, the members of the Printing Association held important posts in the Provisional Government.⁴ Still, they decided to put a strict ban on the discussion of political issues in the paper.

¹ *Oregon Spectator* (from now on OS), 19 February 1846. The pages of the *Oregon Spectator* were not numbered, but it was a four-page paper and the citations I used generally occurred on the front or the second page.

² G. S. Turnbull, *History of Oregon Newspapers*, Portland OR 1939, 25.

³ OS, 5 February 1846.

⁴ George Abernethy was the provisional governor of Oregon, Long was the secretary, Couch the treasurer of the Provisional Government, T’ Vault was the prosecuting at-

The *Oregon Spectator* intended to provide the settlers of Oregon City and its vicinity with local, national, and foreign news as well. In the beginning – to help homeseekers and builders, and attract would be immigrants – it tried to give as much information as possible about the location of the country, the climate, soil, and productions of Oregon. The policy and attitude of the paper, politically, was regulated by the 8th article of the constitution of the Printing Association: “The press owned by or in connection with this association shall never be used by any party for the purpose of propagating sectarian principles or doctrines, nor for the discussion of exclusive party politics.”⁵ The fact that provision was made for amending all articles of the constitution except the eighth indicates the determination of the publishers to have a neutral paper.

The salutary of the first editor of the *Spectator*, William T’Vault, set for the same principle. His main reason for advocating and publishing a politically neutral organ was the nebulous and uncertain situation of the region, which required the cooperation and consensus of the inhabitants.⁶

The *Oregon Spectator* was published from February 1846 to March 1855. During this period the joint British-American occupation of Oregon ended, it officially became American Territory and it was gradually connected to the economic, social, and political life of the United States. From an agricultural community, content with the production of its own primary necessities, Oregon was transformed into an ambitious and enterprising society whose interest was growing in political organization as well. The *Spectator* reflected this transition from the Provisional Government to the Territorial, from the local and isolated situation to the expansive and the national.

In my paper I would like to examine this process with a special emphasis on the editors of the *Oregon Spectator* and their relationship to politics and politicians.

The Oregon Spectator – “Westward the Star of Empire Takes its Way”

The *Oregon Spectator* had been published under all difficulties of the frontier. Mail communication and newspaper exchange had various obstacles, so the editors had to be versatile and resourceful. The *Spectator* had four pages, originally with

torney, Nesmith a circuit court judge, while Newell served on different legislative committees. W. J. Brier, “Political Censorship in the *Oregon Spectator*,” *The Pacific Historical Review* 31:3 (1970), 235.

⁵ OS, 5 February 1846.

⁶ “... it is to be presumed that a portion of the citizens of Oregon have brought with them their views of policy, entertained while residing in the United States. It might also be expected that the *Oregon Spectator* would be a political paper; but reason and good sense argue differently. Situated as we are – remote from the civilized settlements of the United States, and at this time having no protection but that which is afforded us by the Provisional Government of Oregon and having but one interest to represent and that interest the welfare of Oregon and the citizens unanimously ... it would be bad policy to break open old wounds and in doing so create new ones, to discuss politics in the columns of the *Spectator* ...,” OS, 5 February 1846.

four, later with six columns to the page, and it was issued semimonthly. The paper contained miscellaneous information and news reports: acts that regulated the territory, presidential messages, congressional speeches, information about the immigration and the establishment of the economic and social foundations of the settlements, literary and scientific productions, and various advertisements.

The *Spectator* reflected the challenges and difficulties Oregonians had to face during the early development of the region, but its overall tone suggested the optimism of Manifest Destiny. It revealed a great deal about the settlers' hopes and aspirations. The healthy climate and rich soil invited hundreds of immigrants for whom the rivers and the Pacific Ocean offered the facilities of commerce. Their rhetoric, and the justification of their enterprise had a striking resemblance to that of the Puritans who arrived in America two hundred years before them. John Winthrop and his followers intended to set up "a city upon a hill." The nineteenth-century settlers also held that "the responsibilities that rest upon the people of Oregon are mighty." They thought that "if we succeed in setting an example worthy the imitation of the civilized world, we shall never repent of that."⁷

A news item emphasized that Oregon's social, political, and moral state was virtually the same as any other part of the United States, and stressed that "although gathered from the various portions of the Union, the Americans in Oregon are one people."⁸ This argument - in the June 11, 1846 issue - served to justify the American right to the territory.

The treaty making Oregon a part of the United States was signed on June 15 1846, but it was not known in Oregon until November 12. President Polk signed the bill that created Oregon Territory in August, 1848. The settlers, however, decided to commemorate the anniversary of American Independence already in 1846. This was probably the first time when July 4th was celebrated on the West Coast, and the occasion contributed to the development of patriotic sentiments and hope.

The optimistic feeling of the settlers and their belief in Manifest Destiny was expressed in the motto of the *Oregon Spectator* as well. From February 5 1846 to March 2 1852 it was "Westward the Star of Empire Takes its Way."

During this time the *Spectator* had several editors.⁹ The first one was William G. T'Vault, a lawyer who also had some experience in editing. He arrived in Oregon in 1845 and became the postmaster general of the Provisional Government.¹⁰ The Printing Association originally wanted to employ Henry Lee as the editor of the *Oregon Spectator* who asked for 600 dollars. T'Vault was willing to do the job for half as much, so finally it was him who started the paper. His salutatory was ambiguous. On the one hand, he was against publishing a "political paper." On the other hand, he also declared that he was "a Democrat of the Jeffersonian

⁷ OS, 27 July 1848.

⁸ OS, 11 June 1846.

⁹ The main source of biographical information about the editors is Turnbull, *History of Oregon Newspapers*, and Brier, "Political Censorship," 235-240.

¹⁰ T'Vault's signature as Postmaster General can be found under the "Instructions to Postmasters relative to their duties" published in the *Oregon Spectator*, 5 March 1846.

school.”¹¹ He intended to keep to the 8th article of the constitution of the Printing Association, but as we learn from his valedictory, he could not accept that the “junto of aristocrats ... think that they have the right to manage matters as best suit their views.”¹² The Association was also discontented with an editor who opposed their influence, and finally replaced T’Vault by Henry A. G. Lee on April 16 1846.

He came from Virginia in 1843. According to Turnbull, he was “a man of more ability and strength than he ever used in the conduct of the *Spectator*.”¹³ In his first editorial he used the same argument as T’Vault against “fermenting partyism” in the infant settlement, and invited “all” to promote the interests of Oregon: “Politics, as we understand the term, means the science of government and not the effervescence of fermenting partyism, the noisy froth of spouting demagogues.”¹⁴ It is interesting that even though 1846 was an election year he not only published a non-partisan paper, but the *Spectator* also lacked any kind of specific information about the candidates and their platforms.¹⁵ It is true that in that early development of Oregon there were no definite party-lines, yet the candidates probably had certain affiliations and programs. When the paper published the result of the election, however, it only contained a list of the representatives’ names and their counties.¹⁶ The fact that Lee left the editorial chair after nine issues to become a successful negotiator of Indian affairs might suggest his real interests.

The lack of political organization in Oregon, however, did not mean that there was no unity within the American community in opposing the remaining British interests in the region.¹⁷ From August 6 1846, the printer, John Fleming edited the *Oregon Spectator*, and his remarks in the next issue reflected not only the uncertainty about the future of the paper, but also this attitude: “let it sink or swim, the columns of the *Spectator* shall be open for the publication of all matter that shall have for its object the advocating of American interests in this country and their right to the soil, in preference to any other nation of the globe – even to John Bull himself.”¹⁸

George L. Curry arrived in Oregon City at the end of August, and became the editor of the *Spectator* from October 1 1846 to January 28 1848. He intended to keep the paper neutral laying emphasis only on a “consistent American tone.” In his salutatory he promised to avoid “sectism and exclusive party politics” by

¹¹ OS, 5 February 1846.

¹² OS, 2 April 1846.

¹³ Turnbull, *History of Oregon Newspapers*, 44.

¹⁴ OS, 16 April 1846.

¹⁵ The candidates were introduced in small, advertisement-like pieces of news: “please to insert the name of ... as a candidate for representative of ... county, at the ensuing election who will receive the support of MANY VOTERS” OS, 14, 28 May 1846.

¹⁶ OS, 15 June 1846.

¹⁷ W. C. Woodward, *The Rise and Early History of Political Parties in Oregon*. BiblioLife 2009, 30, 33.

¹⁸ OS, 20 August.

"exercising his right of supervision."¹⁹ The Printing Association, however, became jealous of the editorial control of the paper. Like before, they wanted to exercise their censorship, but he would not let them. When Mr. Curry was "expelled" after 15 months, he explained to the readers that it had happened "for no other reason ... than having always endeavored to tell the truth and keep above petty factions and insignificant cliques."²⁰

The next editor, Aaron E. Wait, was a lawyer, who arrived in Oregon in September, 1847. He conducted the *Spectator* for one year from February, 1848. It seems that he could get along with the Printing Association quite well, and managed to follow its rules. Yet, there was a different kind of problem that prevented his success. Gold was discovered in California, and its news reached Oregon City in August, 1848. It was not only many settlers who left for the mines, but the printer also went with them. Consequently, the publication of the *Oregon Spectator* was suspended from September 7 to October 12 1848, and after February 22 1849 again, for more than half a year.

Although the gold rush diverted a lot of immigrants, and many of the Oregonians left their homes to seek their fortune in California, the creation of Oregon Territory in 1848 meant that its situation in the United States was stabilizing. The Oregon Trail continued to be followed by parties of settlers looking for fertile farm lands, or different possibilities of enterprise. They soon realized that California offered a good market for their products. The *Oregon Spectator* was still in the front to encourage immigration. True to its mission as a tireless promoter of Oregon's boundless potential, it predicted that once California's gold had been exhausted, "it will be found that Oregon contains the elements of more wealth than any other portion of the earth of the same magnitude."²¹ People were stimulated to organize agricultural and industrial production on a new and better basis.

The Reverend Wilson Blain, a United Presbyterian clergyman, took "the arduous and responsible duties of the editorial chair" in October, 1849, and asked for the readers' "charitable forbearance" in view of his inexperience. He referred to the limited supply of exchanges of other newspapers and the irregularity of mails that made the publication of the *Spectator* difficult. Nevertheless, his salutatory was optimistic, and reflected the hope of Manifest Destiny when he commended himself and his paper to the "magnanimous support of the whole community" of Oregon that was "laying the foundations of a mighty republic."²²

During Blain's editorship, Robert Moore, then proprietor of Linn City became owner of the paper,²³ but Blain remained the editor until September 5, 1850 when D. J. Schnebly started to edit it weekly. I found no details or explanation about

¹⁹ OS, 1 October 1846.

²⁰ OS, 25 December 1847.

²¹ OS, 24 August 1848.

²² OS, 4 October 1849.

²³ OS, 18 April 1850.

why the Printing Association gave up its ownership. The fact, however, that it was an individual who conducted the paper led to considerable changes.

"Our Paper Will Be Decidedly Whig in Politics, But Decently So"

In September, 1851, D. J. Schnebly became owner of the *Spectator*.²⁴ He tried to remain neutral as long as it was possible. There were two important factors, however, that gradually altered the tone of the paper. One of them was the end of the Printing Association's censorship. As owner and editor of the *Spectator*, Schnebly could exercise full control of its content. The other factor was the stabilization of the Territorial Government in Oregon, which contributed to the extension of the principles and activities of the national political parties over the Pacific Northwest. While during the period of the Provisional Government the political issues and elections were mainly based on local interests, by the early 1850s, the pioneers gradually returned to their old party affiliations and attempted to adapt them to their new environment.

The *Oregon Spectator* rejected the organization of parties in the Territory for a long time. One of the reasons was the isolated situation and limited population of Oregon. The editor did not want its "welfare to be lost sight in the heat of excited political contest."²⁵ On the other hand, he was concerned about the reputation and development of the region. He was afraid that the conflicts, party struggles, and divisions would discourage immigration. The editorials of the *Spectator* several times warned against using the formulation of party lines as a cover under which to attack public officers and political creeds. "It can hardly be expected that the law abiding and law loving citizens of the Eastern States will voluntarily emigrate to any country where its public officers ... are openly accused of corruption, and where ... no security can be expected for the protection of their rights, or preservation of their property."²⁶

When the Democratic party started to become stronger and increasingly influential in the Territory, however, Schnebly could not remain "an idle observer of political events." Even if he still held that it was against the interests of Oregonians to excite party organizations, the *Oregon Spectator* became a Whig organ, although – as he explained – this change was "forced upon us in self-defense."²⁷

It was mainly the Democrats and their organ, the *Oregon Statesman*, against which the *Spectator* had to defend itself. The *Statesman* was edited by Asahel Bush in Salem from March 28, 1851. It was decidedly partisan from its first issue.²⁸

The Democratic party was the first to organize in Oregon mainly because the territory had been established under the administration of a Democratic president, James K. Polk, who appointed Democratic officers. The other reason could be that most of the immigrants arrived from the Mississippi Valley bringing with

²⁴ OS, 9 September 1851.

²⁵ OS, 18 November 1851.

²⁶ OS, 23 December 1851.

²⁷ OS, 3 February 1852.

²⁸ M. Clark, Jr., *Eden Seekers*, Boston 1981, 245–246.

them the Jeffersonian-Jacksonian tradition. The explanation for the attempted neutrality of the *Spectator*, and the publication of the *Statesman* as a Democratic newspaper cannot only be the fact that the settlers were overwhelmingly Democratic and Schnebly wanted to avoid confrontations. From December 4 1850, a characteristically Whig paper, the *Oregonian* was published in Portland to "sustain the present (at that time Whig) administration and advocate all the principles of the great Whig party."²⁹ The *Oregon Spectator*, on the other hand, tried to remain faithful to its original objectives to avoid conflicts, seek consensus, and promote the region, the agricultural and commercial interests of Oregon.

When the *Statesman* started to attack the *Oregonian* and the *Spectator*, Schnebly was really "forced" to react and reveal his sentiments. He was called "a stupid editor", "bullethead", and "blockhead" by the *Statesman* and the printers of the *Spectator* were called "rats" in October 1851,³⁰ but he tried to keep out controversies with the Democratic journal. The events in the winter of 1851-1852, however, accelerated the organization of parties in the Territory, and had a considerable impact on the *Oregon Spectator* as well.

When President Taylor came to office in 1849, he removed the Democratic governor of Oregon, Joseph Lane, and appointed John Gaines in his place. He was, however, "pompous, aristocratic in manners, [and] disdainful of frontier crudities,"³¹ and what is more, a Whig in a territory of Democratic majority. The Legislative Assembly of 1850 not only refused to cooperate with him, but also tried to obstruct his work as much as it could. One of the most important issues of the Assembly was the location of the public buildings in Oregon. It was rather a sectarian question than political, but as the Democrats needed a local issue to unite their forces, they made it "the touchstone of party regularity."³² According to the Organic Laws accepted under the Provisional Government Oregon City was the capital of the Territory, and Governor Gaines saw no reason to change it. The Legislative Assembly, however, decided to place the seat of government in Salem, the penitentiary in Portland, and the university in Marysville (Corvallis). The location of the three public buildings was established in a single act. John Gaines immediately stated that the law was null and void, because the Organic Acts provided that each territorial statute shall embrace a single object. The question was suspended, and both sides were trying to gain supporters to their views before the opening session of the territorial Supreme Court and the legislative Assembly were to meet in December 1851. While the governor was backed by Attorney general John J. Crittenden and President Taylor, the Democrats attacked him "for disregard of the popular will."³³

The *Statesman*, the *Oregonian*, and the *Spectator* dealt with the question in great length, published several opinions on the issue including those of three judges of

²⁹ *Oregonian*, 4 December 1850.

³⁰ OS, 7 October 1851.

³¹ G. N. Belknap, ed., *William Lysander Adams, A Melodrame Entitled 'Treason, Stratagems, and Spoils.'* Hamden CT 1968, 4.

³² J. E. Hendrickson, *Joe Lane of Oregon*. New Haven 1967, 72.

³³ Belknap, *William Lysander Adams*, 6.

the Supreme Court.³⁴ Two of them were Whigs and intended to stay in Oregon City, the third one, Orville C. Pratt, a Democrat, was ready to go to Salem. Finally, it was only five out of the thirty-one members of the Legislative Assembly, and the two Whig judges who stayed in Oregon City. What is more, Pratt found a loophole, and stated that the Organic Act did not say that a law *cannot* embrace *more than one* object, and thereby the statute determining the location of public buildings was valid and binding.³⁵

Finally, it was the Congress that had to settle the legal question. In May, 1852, the Location Law was ratified by unanimous vote of both houses.³⁶ One might wonder how a seemingly simple question could lead to such a complicated situation. I think that the Location Question can serve as an example for the development of political attitudes in Oregon. The whole debate, just like the ones about the appointment of a public printer, or a territorial librarian and the location of the library, or the issue of statehood, indicates the shift in the attitudes to politics from consensus to partisanship.

The controversy also gave rise to a campaign of journalistic invective in Oregon that soon gave its press a national reputation for vigorous and personal abuse. Turnbull described it as the "glorious period of personal journalism."³⁷ According to Belknap the style was common in American newspapers of the time, but "it may have reached its highest point of development in Oregon."³⁸

What became known as the "Oregon style," was a rhetorical technique expressing contempt and sometimes anger in a satirical, biting tone. Asahel Bush, the editor of the *Oregon Statesman* had one of the sharpest pens. He used it with wit against the Whigs in Oregon. I have taken some examples from the *Statesman*, the *Oregonian*, and the *Oregon Spectator* to illustrate the "Oregon style."

In April 1851 in a reply to the charge of the *Oregonian* that the *Statesman* "has made a war against the *Spectator*, ... *Oregonian*, ... Gov. Gaines," Bush described the *Oregonian* as "devoted ... to the grossest personal abuse, the most foul mouthed slander, grovelling scurrility, falsehood and ribald blackguardianism; so much that it has long since ceased to sustain any but a pot-house reputation, or to receive the countenance and respect of any party or community. ... The gentleman (ie. the editor of the *Oregonian*), ... makes himself ... the laughing-stock of the public."³⁹

As the session of the Legislative Assembly was approaching, and the controversy deepening, the tone of the *Statesman* got sharper. At the end of October, 1851 it said about the editor of the *Oregonian*:

³⁴ OS, 9, 23 December 1851, 4, 13 January 1852; *Statesman*, 9 December 1851, 6 January 1852.

³⁵ Pratt's opinion in OS, 4 January 1852, *Statesman*, 6 January 1852.

³⁶ C. H. Carey, *A General History of Oregon Prior to 1861*. Portland OR 1936, 2: 472.

³⁷ Turnbull, *History of Oregon Newspapers*, 82.

³⁸ Belknap, *William Lysander Adams*, 30.

³⁹ *Statesman*, 4 April 1851.

"You are too narrow-minded for liberal and generous writing, a barren source of suggestion, ... and a dangerous calumniator. The essential constituents necessary to make the editor, a portion of which are a deliberate judgement, candor, frankness, truth and fairness ... are ... foreign to your idea of the office of an editor ... you should try and excel the common re-tailer of misrepresentations and falsehood."⁴⁰

In January, 1852 – during the session of the legislative Assembly – Bush published an article from the *Providence Post* that directly attacked the Whigs:

"The best thing the Whig party can do ... is to go into bankruptcy ... we claim no part of what little it may have to divide ... If it owes the country anything on broken promises, the country will be very glad to forgive the debt, if it will not come to the market again."⁴¹

Interestingly (and ironically) enough, the *Oregonian* Democrats did not have to wait long for the Whigs to "settle their debts." In February and March, 1852 over the signature of "Breakspear," the *Oregonian* published a series of articles entitled "Treason, Stratagems and Spoils." It was a five-act "melodrama" which ridiculed Democratic leaders without mercy and became the sensation of the day. Its writer, William Lysander Adams, was originally a teacher who arrived in Oregon in 1848. Then he went to California and found gold, and on returning he bought a farm for himself. In 1851 he started to write articles for the *Oregonian*.

"Treason, Stratagems and Spoils" concentrated his satirical attack on the so called 'Salem Clique'. According to Malcolm Clark's 'definition' it was "a disciplined little band of freebooters which, with Asahel Bush as a brigand-in-chief, would tyrannize Oregon democracy and effectively govern territory and state for a decade."⁴²

George N. Belknap's introduction to the "melodrama" which is based on a thorough research of the historical background of the plot gives a full account of the characters behind the pseudonyms in the play. Judge Pratt is pictured as the conductor of events, helped by Bush, J. Quinn Thornton (a lawyer in Oregon City), Matthew P. Deady, A. L. Lovejoy, Frederick Waymire, Samuel Parker (members of the Council in the 1851-1852 Legislative Assembly), and other Democrats. They are involved in a conspiracy against Whig officials in Oregon. These Democrats not only plan to take over in the territory, but also intend to declare independence of the United States. They are supported by several logrollers, and threats in Bush' newspaper prepare the way for the Whigs' merciless destruction. The Clique's efforts, however, "drown into wine."

According to Belknap, the plot of "Treason, Stratagems and Spoils" paralleled the chronology of the 1851-1852 Assembly, but putting Pratt in the center distorted the actual relationships in the inner circle of the party. There is no doubt about the Judge's political ambitions which started to bother even the Clique after the

⁴⁰ *Statesman*, 28 October 1851.

⁴¹ *Statesman*, 13 January 1852.

⁴² Clark, *Eden Seekers*, 244.

Assembly. Before that, however, the *Statesman* worked on building up his reputation as a brilliant judge, and tried to use his view on the Location Question to influence public opinion in Oregon. I think that we can treat this rearrangement of power relations in the play as a literary device, the manifestation of the writer's freedom, which certainly served his purpose.

Adams dedicated his "melodrame" to the "Association of Gentlemen" who printed a Democratic weekly paper during the Legislative Assembly of 1851-1852. The *Vox Populi* attacked the Whig officials who remained in Oregon City. In a sense, the play was the Whig's answer to these attacks. It effectively illustrated the Clique's methods. They acted under "spiritual influence" of "the Bacchus-distilling juice of corn."⁴³ "The power of [their] hook lies in the bait" compounded of "lie and honey," "mixed, by the laws of chemistry political."⁴⁴ Pratt imagines how "coming times ... shall show the world how well, with whip and spur, I'll ride in a state, their [i.e., the Legislative Assembly's] wretched, abortive, sickly bantling, as hobby to the goal of my desire."⁴⁵ Bush characterizes his "genius" of "low-flung, blustering lying blackguard ribaldry."⁴⁶ The "business" of the "secret league,"⁴⁷ however, ends in drunkenness, some conspirators "mounting on a pile of bacon," others stumbling, leaving "in a snore." Finally everybody falls asleep, lamp goes out, Judge is left alone "in this dark hole" "surrounded by spirits in hell" and exits.⁴⁸

In addition to the series published in the *Oregonian*, "Treason, Stratagems, and Spoils" had two pamphlet editions before the end of April, which were illustrated by woodcuts.⁴⁹

There was no notice of Adams' triumph in the *Statesman*, Bush did not even mention the play in his paper. Instead, he invested his energy into the organization of the Democratic party. They united their forces and had an overwhelming success in the June election.⁵⁰ The news about the decision of the Congress that affirmed the proceedings of the legislation in Salem and recognized the town as territorial capital made their victory complete.

The *Oregon Spectator* did not comment on the "Treason, Stratagems, and Spoils." Although Schnebly revealed his Whig sentiments four days before the *Oregonian* started to publish the "melodrame,"⁵¹ he did not and could not really support his colleague. The *Spectator* was suspended a month later, before the last acts of the play were published. During that month Schnebly's paper was beginning to show the characteristics of the "Oregon style," but in a much milder way than

⁴³ "Treason, Stratagems and Spoils" (henceforth TS&S), 69, Act II, lines 7, 13.

⁴⁴ TS&S, 64, Act I, lines 276, 283, 285.

⁴⁵ TS&S, 58, Act I, lines 38-43.

⁴⁶ TS&S, 91, Act III, lines 105-106.

⁴⁷ TS&S, 73, Act II, lines 143-144.

⁴⁸ TS&S, 146-148, Act V, lines 569, 618, 648-649.

⁴⁹ Clark, *Eden Seekers*, 254.

⁵⁰ Carey, *A General History of Oregon*, 493.

⁵¹ Schnebly declared his Whig sentiments in the 3 February 1852 issue of the *Spectator*, the *Oregonian* published the series in its 7, 14, 21 February, and 6, 13 March 1852 issues.

either the *Statesman* or the *Oregonian* did. Belknap says that contemporary slang and colloquialisms were more common in Democratic press, and "Whig editors deplored such vulgarity but were forced to compete."⁵² A good example could be when the *Statesman* claimed "great powers of mind for Judge Pratt," and Schnebly declared that "our service shall be rendered very willingly to the putting down of all such humbuggers of people's rights and opinions."⁵³ In the same issue the *Spectator* called the members of the Legislative Assembly "coarse personalities" who were "more becoming an enraged and riotous populace than a legislative body."⁵⁴

The publication of the *Spectator* was suspended after March 2 1852, for more than a year. It is not clear whether the long break was due to the shortage of paper or money, censorship, or the absence of the editor or the printer as in some other cases. It was Schnebly who started to edit it again in August, 1853. Instead of giving an explanation, he changed the motto of the paper. It had a more personal tone (and local reference) than the old one, but suggested the same optimism: "Our Hope is in the Future, and Success our Firm Determination." He reinforced that the *Spectator* would be "decidedly Whig in politics." At the same time, however, he also found it important to state that it would be "decently so," and added that "we have no affection for popular clap-traps or demagogic humbugs."⁵⁵

The content of the paper did not change much, and it certainly was not very vitriolic. There were only a few editorials that were written in the "Oregon style." Analyzing the caucus system of the Democratic party, for example, Schnebly held that their method was "more apt to place in power the trickster and shrewd maneuverer than honest highminded and worthy men."⁵⁶

By the end of 1853, significant changes occurred in the political life of Oregon, and the *Spectator* commented on the weakening of the Democrats. "The agonies of the *Statesman* clique are deep-rooted ... even salt will not save them."⁵⁷ According to a news report in the *Spectator*, the "corrupt and factitious" Democrats' nominations for the legislative elections were accompanied by "anarchy and confusion" while the Whigs' choice of men of "integrity, experience, and Whig fidelity" was characterized by "unanimity."⁵⁸ This was obviously an exaggeration, and contradicted Schnebly's earlier remarks in the salutatory that "honesty is best

⁵² Belknap, *William Lysander Adams*, 32.

⁵³ OS, February 24 1852.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ OS, 19 August 1853.

⁵⁶ Schnebly described their method: "A few men in one instance got together and called themselves the democratic party [...] Among themselves they portioned out the best offices. After this was gone through with they called themselves an organized body [...] Every person who failed to join the band [sic] were from that time decried and all sorts of epithets employed to bring them into disrepute." OS, 12 November 1853.

⁵⁷ OS, 3 November 1853.

⁵⁸ OS, 10 December 1853.

policy.”⁵⁹ Yet, it shows how significant the influence of the general political climate was becoming in Oregon. The territory was increasingly linked to national politics. The immigrants were never indifferent to the changes in the country, and the newspapers tried to serve their broadening interests. The shift, the increasing involvement in politics was reflected in the *Oregon Spectator* already under Schnebly, and even more when it was taken over by C. L. Goodrich in March 1854. Its motto was changed to express the readiness to take part in politics: “Agitation of Thought is the Beginning of Wisdom!”⁶⁰

“America For ever!”

The new editor had to deal with three major issues. Two of them were political in nature while the third one determined the fate of the paper.

As political activity was increasing in the territory, people started to propose to change the status of Oregon in the United States, and make it a state. It was not really a new idea. Democrats under the administration of a Whig president were seeking to find a solution to their situation by initiating statehood in early 1852. With the election of Franklin Pierce, however, who replaced the Whig officials with Democrats, they did not really need statehood to achieve influence in Oregon. There was, however, a strong tradition of self-government in the territory which was already reflected in the formation of the Provisional Government in 1843. In contrast to that, the territorial system meant a close Congressional control. Furthermore, the executive and judicial branches of government were filled by the president’s appointees. After passing a nebulous territorial status, political parties started to organize in the territory, and their increasing activity enlivened the movement for statehood. It was again the Democratic party that advocated the formulation of a state at the beginning of 1854. Even though the president was a Democrat, the Salem Clique did not like his appointees, and memorialized Congress for permission to draft a state constitution.⁶¹

The *Spectator* opened a discussion on the subject⁶² and most of the Whig correspondents argued against statehood. Their strongest objection was that “it would cost too much.”⁶³ There were different calculations in the paper about how much more tax should be paid to support a state government.⁶⁴ A lot of people argued that the population of Oregon was growing steadily and business was improving considerably, and the change of government would have no real influence on its prosperity.⁶⁵ Others urged to “take the matters in our own hands,” otherwise “we will have no Territory to make a state of” as Congress already created Washing-

⁵⁹ OS, 19 August 1853.

⁶⁰ OS, 4 March 1854.

⁶¹ Hendrickson, *Joe Lane of Oregon*, 94.

⁶² OS, 24 March 1854.

⁶³ OS, 21 April 1854.

⁶⁴ OS, 21 April, 4 May 1854.

⁶⁵ “We possess every necessary element for success [...] If Oregon cannot prosper now, she never can.” OS, 19 May 1854.

ton Territory out of Oregon in 1853.⁶⁶ In the end, people voted on the issue in June 1854, and the measure was defeated.⁶⁷ Oregonians decided to "wait awhile and mature in strength."⁶⁸

Besides the movement for statehood, there was another issue that linked Oregon to national politics. The Democratic and Whig parties went through a kind of reorganization in the early 1850s, and the process offered an opportunity to gain popular support for other movements. In July 1854, the *Oregon Spectator* published an article from the *New York Herald* about "the newest political movement of the day." It described the "total defeat" of the Whig party in 1852, and the dissolution of the Democratic party under Pierce, and told about two emerging movements. One of them was the temperance movement that wanted to prohibit the manufacture and sale of any intoxicating liquor. Attempts to enforce such regulations found considerable support in Oregon, but also incited riots, and political parties were profoundly affected as well. The issue was addressed by the other new movement, the Know-Nothing party, too, as many prohibitionists joined them.

The Know-Nothings proposed to exclude Roman Catholics and foreigners from the suffrage and any public office. According to Malcolm Clark its predecessor was the Supreme Order of the Star-Spangled Banner, which was founded in 1849. They promised to vote only for native-born Protestants, and to work for a twenty-one-year probationary period before naturalization of immigrants. Their principles were adapted by the American party that was founded in 1852.⁶⁹ John Mulkern writing about *The Know-Nothing Party in Massachusetts* – where it had the greatest influence – found that there were historians who pointed out that the movement advocated not only nativism, but also antimonopoly reforms and anti-slavery.⁷⁰

The American party started to organize in California in May 1854, and reached Oregon City in August, 1855.⁷¹

The news report about the native movement that the *Oregon Spectator* borrowed from the *New York Herald* in July, 1854 was a kind of introductory one. It gave an account on the main principles of Americanism, explained the "mysterious manner" of its "silent operation."⁷² As opposed to the Whig and Democratic parties characterized by division, corruption, and demoralization, the next news item taken from the *New York Herald* described the "unparalleled progress" of the Know-Nothing movement.⁷³ It is interesting that the same article was published again in the September 2 issue of the *Spectator* together with one from the *Type of the Times* that reported on the Know-Nothing triumph in Philadelphia and with

⁶⁶ OS, 19 May 1854.

⁶⁷ Carey, *A General History of Oregon*, 504.

⁶⁸ OS, 24 March 1854.

⁶⁹ Clark, *Eden Seekers*, 271.

⁷⁰ J. R. Mulkern, *The Know-Nothing Party in Massachusetts*. Boston 1990, 187.

⁷¹ Clark, *Eden Seekers*, 272.

⁷² OS, 21 July 1854.

⁷³ OS, 11 August 1854.

another one from the *Baltimore Patriot* about the aims of the movement. The *Spectator* simply borrowed these articles but did not comment on them. What is more, in a response to Bush's attack on the Native movement, Goodrich stated that "the idea" that the Know-Nothings "act in concert with the Whigs" was "all malicious falsehood."⁷⁴ Two weeks later, however, a long editorial in the *Spectator* was already justifying Americanism and warned against foreign influence. Even the motto of the paper was changed to "America Forever! Our own Dear Native Land! For the Distant West Echoes back the Gladsome South!"⁷⁵ In the next issue the editor dealt with Roman Catholics and said that the movement was not against their religion, only against their involvement in politics.⁷⁶ Then on October 7 1854, Goodrich informed the readers that "hereafter the *Spectator* will endeavor to promulgate the doctrines of true Americanism." The motto was changed again to emphasize "Freedom from All Foreign Influence in this our own Native Land!"⁷⁷

Although the editor of the *Oregon Spectator* dedicated himself to the advancement of American interests in the territory, he did not give up his Whig sentiments either. He was a member of the Whig Committee of Clackamas County and also an advocate of the Know-Nothing party. This offered a good opportunity for the Democrats to identify Americanism with Whiggery. Goodrich, however, called it "a ridiculous idea,"⁷⁸ and argued that the movement was composed of men of all classes without regard to political or religious opinion. He revived the 'Oregon style' to answer the charge of a new Democratic paper, the *Standard*, and stated that its editor was "the most accomplished liar, ... a lunatic, ... laboring under a temporary fit of morbid insanity."⁷⁹

It was Goodrich who was closer to the truth. As I referred to it earlier, the American movement tried to unite various interests: Whigs, prohibitionists, and dissident Democrats as well. Like in other parts of the United States, the Know-Nothings of Oregon opposed not only foreigners, but also the Democratic party. Their success, however, was short-lived. Bush and the Salem Clique tried to combat them in two important ways. The *Statesman* published the names of the leading figures of Americanism, revealed its code, aim, signs, and rituals.⁸⁰ Furthermore, the Democrats initiated the so called "*viva voce* bill" which required that votes in the territorial elections should be given openly, not by ballot. The bill was passed by the Legislative Assembly in December, 1854. It had a considerable impact on the elections of 1855. On the one hand, it discouraged Know-Nothings, on the other hand, it kept back several Democrats who were thinking about leav-

⁷⁴ OS, 2 September 1854.

⁷⁵ OS, 16 September 1854.

⁷⁶ OS, 23 September 1854.

⁷⁷ OS, 7 October 1854.

⁷⁸ OS, 21 October 1854.

⁷⁹ OS, 18 November, 21 October 1854.

⁸⁰ *Statesman*, November 1, 1854.

ing the party. Seven of nine council and twenty-eight of thirty assembly seats were gained by Democrats, which restored their control in the Territory.⁸¹

The *Oregon Spectator* could not report on the elections, because it was suspended in March, 1855. In his valedictory, Goodrich reinforced his Whig position, but admitted that he had "a special respect for American-born white men and women."⁸² He also explained why he had to say "Adieu!" In a bitter and rather harsh tone, he described the financial difficulties the paper had to face which finally made him suspend its publication. There were two main problems: the scarcity of paper and the failure of the subscribers to pay for the newspaper. In August, 1854, there was a deduction in the price of the *Oregon Spectator*,⁸³ and from September on the editor repeatedly asked the subscribers to pay up their debts to the *Spectator*.⁸⁴ Goodrich's financial problems were not unique in the territory. He reported in November that many publishers were becoming alarmed because of the scarcity of paper and its consequent increase in price. Even though he could assure the readers of the *Spectator* that he had received a new supply for several months, he had to ask them that "perhaps before that is gone [they] will pay up so that we can get a year's supply at one purchase."⁸⁵ The situation, however, did not really change. The editor had to try a more effective way to get his money. In December he announced in the paper that "on the first day of March 1855 we shall send bills ... to all those persons who shall have paid nothing on subscription to the *Oregon Spectator* for a year and a half [sic] previous to that date."⁸⁶ The warning was repeated in several issues of the paper,⁸⁷ but it seems that it did not help. It was in February 1855, when Goodrich attempted to make a last desperate request, and said that thereafter the paper would only be sent to those who paid its costs. He added that "we know of many respectable men who would hate to have their names to appear on a supplementary list as not having paid us."⁸⁸

Finally, he was forced to give up, and with the March 10 1855, issue he permanently suspended the publication of the *Oregon Spectator*. His farewell was bitter, and he himself quite disappointed, but he also made it clear that "with regard to the course we have pursued ... we have no regrets to make ... nothing to swallow." His closing remark echoed the main purpose of the first editors of the paper: "we have been the 'tool' of no person, factions or cliques."⁸⁹

George S. Turnbull in the *History of Oregon Newspapers* devotes a few pages to the biographies of the first editors of the *Oregon Spectator*, but he says nothing about the life of D. J. Schnebly and C. L. Goodrich. He writes about the latter, for

⁸¹ Clark, *Eden Seekers*, 276.

⁸² OS, 10 March 1855.

⁸³ OS, 26 August 1854.

⁸⁴ OS, 23 September, 7 October 1854.

⁸⁵ OS, 18 November 1854.

⁸⁶ OS, 9 December 1854.

⁸⁷ OS, 16, 23 December, 17 January.

⁸⁸ OS, 3 February 1855.

⁸⁹ OS, 10 March 1855.

example, that "Goodrich is remembered chiefly for having suspended the paper permanently."⁹⁰ I find his approach as well as his statement that "politically the *Spectator* was never influential"⁹¹ a little bit simplifying and misleading.

In my paper I tried to trace and illustrate the gradual transformation of the *Oregon Spectator*. It was started during the early, nebulous state of Oregon when its inhabitants were relatively non-partisan. Then as the Territory was established and it was increasingly attached to the economic and political life of the United States, the sense of isolation was removed, and people came to a new realization of their relationship to the rest of the country. What they referred to as "the States" in the beginning – suggesting their remoteness and the local characteristics of their experience – started to have greater and greater influence on their lives. This development was reflected in the *Oregon Spectator*. In a sense, the attention Turnbull devoted to the editors' biographies can indicate this shift. He spent some time discussing the careers of the first editors, because in most of the cases, editing the *Spectator* was only a short episode in their lives. They endeavored it to serve the community, but then either got into conflict with censorship, or soon decided to pursue a different career. It is not to say, of course, that what they did for starting the first newspaper on the West coast, keeping it not only alive, but also devoting it to the promotion of the interests of Oregon, was an easy enterprise. It is possible, however, that Turnbull did not discuss the last two editors' career, because theirs was more closely linked to the *Spectator*. He did not have to speak about their biographies, because their paper told about their attitudes. When Schnebly and Goodrich edited the *Oregon Spectator*, the newspaper was under their full control. Influenced by the changes it dealt with the legal and political controversies that characterized the opening years of Territorial Government in Oregon. They were – though only slightly – even influenced by the "Oregon style."

I think that the mottoes of the *Oregon Spectator* well illustrate the transformation that occurred in Oregon during its publication. As the situation of the territory was becoming stabilized, the emphasis shifted from promotion of local interests to representing the objectives of a national party.

It is difficult to tell how influential the *Oregon Spectator* actually was. It was probably read by a lot more people than its circulation – 155 subscribers in 1846⁹² and between two and three hundred in 1855⁹³ – suggests. The subscribers could share the paper with their neighbors and friends. It was a very important mediator of information to the settlers of Oregon City and its vicinity especially when it was the only paper in the territory. Although news-gathering and exchange had various obstacles, the editors tried to provide their readers with as much information as they could.

⁹⁰ Turnbull, *History of Oregon Newspapers*, 47.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² OS, 16 April 1846.

⁹³ OS, 3 February 1855.

The *Oregon Spectator* indicated, was stimulated by, and served the interests of Oregon's growing population. It expressed the settlers' motivations, expectations, and experience. Its neutral tone was gradually changed due to the emergence of partisanship, but it never stopped to promote the "greatness"⁹⁴ of the territory. The editors' changing relationship to politics reflected the developments and transformation that took place in Oregon from the mid-1840s to the mid-1850s.

⁹⁴ OS, 5 May 1854.

Supplementary to the History of Egyptian–Hungarian Relations

ABDALLAH ABDEL-ATY
(*Egyptian International Academy, Cairo*)



Egypt and Hungary have a long common historical past, which is characterized by fruitful diplomatic and political cooperation. The twenty years between 1919 and 1939 included a significant, active, and changeable period in the history of diplomatic and political relations between Hungary and Egypt according to the archival materials, other sources, as well as the articles of the Egyptian press. The chronological frame of this research has a precise starting- and end-point. The plan of the establishment of a Hungarian Consulate in Cairo on January 10, 1924 can be regarded as the beginning. The final event was on April 30, 1939 when Miklós Horthy, the son of the regent of Hungary, visited Egypt again to negotiate and discuss with Egyptian officials. The period between 1919 and 1939 has been studied on the basis of the sources of the archive of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry and the contemporary Arabic, English and French press in Egypt.

The historical antecedents of the Egyptian–Hungarian diplomatic relations

After signing the peace treaty known as “Pozsarevác” between the Habsburgs and the Ottoman Empire, the Habsburg Empire had the possibility to establish a consulate in Alexandria, the second largest Egyptian city and the first commercial center in the country. In 1763 Francesco Agostini became the agent in charge of consular affairs, then the empress, Maria Theresa appointed Agostini in 1785 as consul in Egypt, who was followed in 1792 by Carlo Di Rossetti, who was responsible for the General Consulate in Cairo until 1805. When he resigned from his position in 1811 Agostini became responsible again for the consular affairs.¹ The General Consul worked in Cairo until 1819. As a consequence of the continuously increasing economic activity and trade in Alexandria, he moved to Alexandria again. Cairo and Damietta had vice-consulates, and there was a consular agency authorized to direct the Consular Affairs in Rashid. In 1834 Anton Laurin was appointed general consul, who was an experienced diplomat, as there were

¹ They appointed George Cavaccó as consul, and Franz Champion as vice-consul in 1819.

more and more tasks for the diplomatic corps including navigation, commercial, political, and medical affairs. In 1846 the Habsburg representations were restructured: the General Consulate in Alexandria supervised both the prosecution Consulate in Cairo, Damietta, as well as the Consular Agency in Rashid and Suez.²

The main reason behind the establishment of diplomatic representation in Suez and Port Said was the growing trade-traffic route from India and other eastern countries. On August 17, 1871 Otto Szillas was sent and appointed as consul in Suez. From 1878 until World War I an honorary consular agency worked in Suez because its role had decreased significantly.³

In 1910 the authorities and the geographical division of the diplomatic corps of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy were restructured as follows: 1) General Consulate in Cairo, its authorities extended to the whole Egypt; 2) Consulate in Alexandria; 3) Consulate in Cairo (Court consulate as well); 4) Consulate in Port Said (Court consulate as well); 5) Consulate in Khartoum (Court consulate as well), and its authority included all the Sudanese territories.⁴

After the outbreak of World War I the representative of the United States received the authorities and functions of the Consul of Austria-Hungary in Cairo. The Austrian-Hungarian diplomatic presence in Cairo lasted till September, 1914, when General Maxwell, commander of the occupier British army⁵ expelled the diplomats and employees of the German and Austro-Hungarian consulates from Egypt. Only one consular officer remained in Cairo until he was arrested by the British army in December, 1915.⁶

Egyptian-Hungarian diplomatic relations between World War I and II

After the First World War and the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Hungary became independent as a result of the Treaty of "Trianon", paying a terrible price for it by losing two thirds of her territory and one third of the inhabitants. The new states around Hungary tried to isolate it with French help. After a successful consolidation of the state and the completion of internal stability, Hunga-

² R. Agstner, Von k.k. Konsularagentie zum Österreichischen Generalkonsulat, Cairo 1993, 21-27. cited in K. Komár, *Relations between Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Egypt 1882-1914*. PhD-dissertation, Faculty of Arts, University of Szeged, Szeged 2006, 70.

³ HHStA, AR. F8. Staaten. Kairo, 1891. June 1. Nr. XXVIII/B/adm. Heidler. cited in Komár, *Relations*, 71.

⁴ HHStA, AR. F8. ad. Nr. 901. Alexandria, 1882. June 3. Suzzara The consul in Alexandria to Kossiek, the general consul in Cairo. cited in Komár, *Relations*, 72-74.

⁵ General Sir John Grenfell Maxwell GCB, KCMG, CVO, DSO (1859-1929) was a British Army officer and colonial regent. Maxwell received a commission into the British Army in 1879. He served on the Western Front in the First World War until he was given command of the Army in Egypt, where he successfully held the Suez Canal against Turkish attack. Maxwell was assigned in 1916 to be General Officer Commanding-in-Chief for Northern Command at York. He was promoted in June 1919 to full general and retired in 1922.

⁶ R. Agstner, *Der Ballhausplatz und Nordafrika, Studien zur Präsenz von Österreich (-Ungarn) in Kairo, Kossier, Luxor, Tripolis und Bengasi*. Cairo 1995, 7-8.

ry began to build new foreign relations. Thus Hungary set up its first diplomatic relations with the Holy Chair.⁷

The plan to establish a Hungarian consulate in Egypt fitted into the above mentioned framework. *Al-Ahram*, a daily Arabic-language newspaper wrote about this important matter in its political column on January 10, 1924.⁸ Due to the facilities provided by the Egyptian side, the plan of establishing a Hungarian consulate in Egypt progressed rapidly. As a result, in twenty days, on February 1, 1924, *Al-Ahram* reported that the King of Egypt, Fouad received the credentials of the Hungarian General Consul Alfréd Menasce. It was the foundation of the first independent Hungarian General Consulate in Alexandria.⁹

The next important step took place three years later. *Al-Ahram* reported on October 29, 1927 that the Hungarian Plenipotentiary Minister accredited to London had contacted the Egyptian Embassy in the British capital.¹⁰ The newspaper wrote that the Hungarian side intended to establish an embassy¹¹ in Cairo in order to protect the Hungarian interests and to develop and strengthen the cooperation between the two countries. In response to the initiative, the Egyptian Office in London sent the Hungarian proposal to the Egyptian government.¹² A year later, *Al-Ahram* reported citing reports from Budapest that the Hungarian government agreed to establish a Hungarian Embassy in Cairo, and Félix Parcher will be the first Plenipotentiary Minister of Hungary in Cairo and he will take over the affairs of the embassy from the city of Berne, Switzerland.¹³ On 20 February 1928 King Fouad met the first Hungarian ambassador in the royal palace, who in turn handed over his credentials to his Majesty. The Plenipotentiary Minister discussed the bilateral relations and international problems with the king.¹⁴

The day after presenting his credentials to the Egyptian King, *Al-Ahram* published an interview with the first Hungarian Plenipotentiary Minister in Cairo, Mr. Félix Parcher on February 20, 1928 on page five. According to the journalist, the Hungarian diplomat was very friendly and met him with pleasure. He was fluent in Arabic and he read *Al-Ahram* daily in order to enrich his Arabic knowledge. He spoke of the Egyptian newspaper with high esteem, as it was

⁷ I. Zombori, Magyarország és a Szentszék diplomáciai kapcsolata, 1920–2000. [Diplomatic Relations between Hungary and the Holy See, 1920–2000] Budapest, 2001, 7.

⁸ "Hungarian Consulate-General in Egypt," *Al-Ahram* (1924/-), 4.

⁹ "The Foreign Consulates" *Al-Ahram* (1924/-), 4.

¹⁰ From 1927 until October 3, 1928. Sizostiris Sidarus Bey was the Egyptian Minister Plenipotentiary in London, and on October 4, 1928 was followed by Abdel-Malek Hamza Bey.

¹¹ The article of *Al-Ahram* wrote that the Hungarian government wanted to establish a consulate in Egypt. This information was incorrect. The journalist made a mistake, instead of writing 'embassy' he wrote 'consulate'.

¹² "Hungarian Consulate in Cairo," *Al-Ahram* (1927/-), 4.

¹³ "Establishment of Hungarian Embassy in Egypt," *Al-Ahram* (1928/-), 2.

¹⁴ Abdin Royal Palace Archive, Cairo, 20 February 1928. Archived document about when the King Fouad met the first Hungarian Ambassador in the royal palace, and who in turn handed over his credentials to His Majesty, the King.

characterized by a balanced view and it had leading role in the Arabic world. His Excellency, the Plenipotentiary Minister of Hungary, said that in May, 1900, after his graduation, he worked as an attaché in the Austro-Hungarian Consulate in Alexandria and then in Cairo. The journalist emphasized that the Hungarian Plenipotentiary Minister was affected by Egypt. The diplomat assured that the priority in his diplomatic activity was to strengthen the Egyptian-Hungarian economic and commercial relations. He strove to finalize the talks, which were started by Alfréd Menasce, the Hungarian General Honorary Consul in Alexandria about the commercial agreement between the two countries.¹⁵

Al-Ahram published in its issue dated February 28, 1928 the meeting of the new Hungarian Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary during the presentation of his credentials to His Majesty, the King. The Hungarian diplomat said: "Majesty! It gives me the honor to present to you the credentials, which were accredited to me by the regent of the Kingdom of Hungary to make me the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to your Majesty. I hope Your Majesty will let me be the spokesman for the Hungarian regent: Our regent is expressing his great appreciation and affection to your majesty and is wishing happiness, welfare, and progress to Your Majesty, your family, and your people! Sir, Your Majesty, allow me to add my great respects. I hope Your Majesty will find it worth to take interest in my efforts to carry out my mission and complete the task we begin today. The purpose is to consolidate and strengthen friendly relations and promote understanding between the two kingdoms."

After the last talk, and presentation of credentials, the response of the King was the following: "Excellency! It gives me pleasure to accept your message in this official concert, which the regent of the Kingdom of Hungary accredited to you as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary. It makes me happier that it is the first time that the Kingdom of Hungary has its representative in my country, and I expect from the establishment of this representation an explosive growth in strengthening friendly relations and promoting understanding between the two kingdoms, which will produce more benefits. The Hungarian regent's emotions expressed to me, to my country, and to my family have had the most beautiful effect on me. So accept my sincere thanks and give them to his Majesty, the Hungarian regent with my hopes for the happiness and prosperity of the Kingdom of Hungary. Thank you for the efforts that you will take to complete your mission. I assure you that you can depend on my support and my government's help."¹⁶

Félix Parcher performed his duties as an Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Minister in Cairo from the Swiss capital, Bern, he came to Cairo every year staying for two months. *Al-Ahram* published the news on January 24, 1929 that Hafiz Afifi Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, invited Parcher to a banquet before his

¹⁵ M. Fatah-Allah, "Quarter with the New Hungarian Minister Plenipotentiary," *Al-Ahram* (1928), 5.

¹⁶ "Between Egypt and Hungary," *Al-Ahram* (1928/-), 4.

departure to Switzerland. Tawfiq Nasim Pasha¹⁷ and a large group of foreign diplomats appeared at the dinner.¹⁸

Félix Parcher died in 1933 and Dr. Pál Förstner was appointed in his position as temporary charge of affairs, who led the Hungarian Embassy in Cairo from Budapest.¹⁹ He succeeded in signing a trade agreement with the Egyptian side, under which the Egyptian cotton was exported to Hungary in exchange for agricultural machines to Egypt.²⁰

In 1937 Lajos Rudnay became charge of affairs.²¹ On December 22, 1937, *Al-Ahram* published a large photo on its front page and stated that the previous day Lajos Rudnay, the Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Minister of Hungary had given his credentials to the king of Egypt.²²

The embassy moved to Cairo in 1939, and the ambassador stayed in Cairo from that time.²³ Andor Semsey, who was from an aristocratic family, arrived in Cairo as charge of affairs.²⁴ Semsey was very fond of hunting, it was his real hobby. He repeatedly said that he preferred to retire or give up his post in Egypt because he could not practice his favorite hobby there.²⁵ *Al-Ahram* reported on February 22, 1939 that Semsey had given his credentials to the Egyptian King in the Abdin Palace. After the meeting Mr. Ismail Taimour said farewell and good-bye to Semsey. On the first page of the *Al-Ahram* a photo of the Hungarian Minister Plenipotentiary with Ismail Taimour can be seen.²⁶ The Hungarian Kingdom had his first Embassy in Cairo in the entire African continent, and had continued its work until the middle of 1941. In April, 1941, the Hungarian Plenipotentiary Minister was called back to Budapest.²⁷

¹⁷ He was considered one of the most important leaders of the National Democratic Party, and was a prime minister several times. He was the best-known political figure in Hungary in the first half of the twentieth century.

¹⁸ "The Hungarian Plenipotentiary Minister," *Al-Ahram* (1929/-), 4.

¹⁹ Y. L. Rezk, "The Egyptian Foreign Ministry 1826-1937," *Al-Qahira: Al-Haia' Al-Masria Al-Amma Lel-Ketab*, 1989, 135.

²⁰ F.O. 407/219 (I) Enc. In No. 49. Annual Report on Heads of Foreign Missions... op. cit. in S. Shakerr, "Egyptian Foreign Ministry 1937-1953," *Al-Qahira: Matba'at Dar Al-Kotobb Aal-Watha'ek Al-Kawmia*, 2006, 43.

²¹ F.O. 407/223 (II) Enc. In No. 34. Annual Report on Heads of Foreign Missions... op. cit. in Shakerr, "Egyptian Foreign Ministry 1937-1953," 43.

²² "The Greek and the Hungarian Ministers Plenipotentiary give their credentials to the King," *Al-Ahram* (1937:19136), 1.

²³ F. Nagy, "Külgügyminisztérium Levéltára (1918-1945)," [Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs] Vol. 2. *Külgügyminisztérium, Utazás, és Ütlevélgügyi, Osztály, Külképviseltek, Egyéb Szervek, Irathagyatékok Repertorium*. Budapest 2007, 103.

²⁴ From the status of Second Counsellor he rose to the First Secretary title, charge of affairs.

²⁵ Shakerr, "Egyptian Foreign Ministry 1937-1953," 43.

²⁶ "The Hungarian Minister Plenipotentiary at Abdin Palace," *Al-Ahram* (1939/19556), 1.

²⁷ J. Sáringer, *Documentation a l'histoire de la diplomatie Hongroise de 1920 à 1944*. PhD-dissertation, Faculty of Arts, Szeged 2005, 98.

Leaders of the Embassy of the Hungarian Kingdom:

Félix Parcher (10 February 1928–1 December 1931) he managed the embassy's tasks from Bern

Félix Parcher (1 December 1931–1 February 1933); he managed it from Budapest
Pál Förstner charge of affairs (1 February 1933–23 October 1937); he stayed in Cairo

Lajos Rudnay (23 October 1937–14 January 1939) he managed it from Athens

Andor Semsey charge of affairs (14 January 1939–April 1940); he stayed in Cairo

László Mára charge of affairs (1940–7 April 1941).²⁸

Country	City	#	Nature or Type	Leader	Year
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate General	Alfréd Menasce	1924
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate General	Alfréd Menasce	1925
Egypt	Cairo	1	Honorary Consulate	Moussa Green	1925
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1925
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate General	Alfréd Menasce	1927
Egypt	Cairo	1	Honorary Consulate	Moussa Green	1927
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1927
Egypt	Cairo	1	Honorary Consulate	Moussa Green	1928
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1928
Egypt	Cairo	1	Honorary Consulate	Moussa Green	1929
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1929
Egypt	Cairo	2	Honorary Consulate General	Moussa Green	1930
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1930
Egypt	Cairo	2	Honorary Consulate General	Moussa Green	1932
Egypt	Alexandria	1	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1932
Egypt	Cairo	1	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1933
Egypt	Alexandria	2	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1933
Egypt	Alexandria	3	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1934

²⁸ J. Sáringer, *Adattár a magyar külügyi szolgálat történetéhez (1920–1944)*. [Data to the history of the Hungarian diplomatic service, 1920–1944] Budapest 2004, 60.

Egypt	Cairo	1	Alexandrian Consulate Branch	László Menczer	1936
Egypt	Alexandria	3	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1936
Egypt	Cairo	1	Alexandrian Consulate General Branch	György Reichmann	1937
Egypt	Alexandria	3	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1937
Egypt	Cairo	1	Alexandrian Consulate Branch	György Reichmann	1938
Egypt	Alexandria	3	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1938
Egypt	Alexandria	3	Honorary Consulate General	László Páthy (Polnauer)	1941 ²⁹

In reciprocity the Egyptian government established an Embassy in Hungary. The Egyptian Plenipotentiary Minister arrived in Budapest. *Al-Ahram* wrote about him on October 14, 1938 quoting from the German news agency: "Mourad Sayed Ahmed Pasha, Plenipotentiary Minister of Egypt had given his credentials to Admiral Horthy, the Regent of Hungary."³⁰

The visits of Miklós Horthy's son to Egypt

The son of the regent of Hungary, jr. Miklós Horthy's visit in Egypt had primary importance among the visits of Hungarian politicians and the elite in Egypt. On April 15, 1932 the English-speaking *Egyptian Mail* newspaper reported that Horthy had arrived on the ship *Ausonia* at the port of Alexandria as the head of the high-level delegation. The newspaper indicated: "Mr. Horthy is traveling strictly incognito."³¹ On April 21 Horthy visited the Pyramids and the Sphinx in Giza accompanied by Alajos De Paikert the first Hungarian director of Fouad I Agricultural Museum of Cairo and by Mr. Burghoffer. The report appeared on the first page of the newspaper with a large photo of the guests.³² On April 25 *Al-Ahram* published a long article on the son of the regent of the Hungarian Kingdom. The newspaper reported: "in spite of the young age of the son of the Hungarian regent, Mr. Miklós Horthy is the director of the Hungarian English Bank and works in business. While staying in Egypt he took the opportunity to negotiate with the experts of the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Agricul-

²⁹ *Ibid.* 95-177.

³⁰ "The Egyptian Plenipotentiary Minister in Budapest," *Al-Ahram* (1938/-), 8. The Egyptian accredited Plenipotentiary Ministers to Budapest were: from Austria Ahmed El Kadry bey (17 November 1936-1938); Ahmed Mourad Sid pasa (12 October 1938-1940); Mohamed Soliman El Hout bey charge of affairs (1940); Abdel Kerim Safvat charge of affairs (13 April 1940-1942). From 1943 the embassy was directed from Switzerland. Sáringer, *Adattár*, 60.

³¹ "Hungarian Regent's Son in Alexandria," *Egyptian Mail* (1932/6005), 3.

³² "Hungarian Regent's son at the pyramids," *Egyptian Mail* (1932/6009), 1.

tural Credit Bank to do business between Egypt and Hungary." The guest suggested that Hungary should buy a significant quantity of cotton from the Egyptian government and Hungary should pay for it by building factories, rice stores, and exporting fertilizers to the Egyptian side. The Hungarian guest visited the Ministry of Finance and Agriculture several times to discuss the matter accompanied by László Polnauer, the Hungarian General Consul in Alexandria, and by the famous trader Landman.³³

On February 14, 1934 *Al-Ahram* carried the news that Horthy junior left Rome for Alexandria on the ship "Calitia".³⁴ After three days, he arrived at the port of Alexandria, where he was greeted by László Polnauer, the Hungarian Honorary General Consul. The Hungarian politicians appeared in a large photo on the first page of *Al-Ahram*, the most popular Arabic newspaper, which reflected the importance of the visit of the honored guest.³⁵

On February 25, 1938 *Al-Ahram* indicated that Miklós Horthy had stayed in Egypt for a few weeks, and that on February 24, 1938 he left for Europe. He was accompanied to the port of Alexandria by László Polnauer, the Hungarian Honorary General Consul in Alexandria and by some illustrious members of the Hungarian community in Egypt.³⁶

On February 8, 1939 *Al-Ahram* said that Miklós Horthy junior arrived at Alexandria a day before and was accompanied by the sister of Princess Károly. Mr. László Polnauer, the Hungarian Honorary General Consul in Alexandria received them. They were to travel to Cairo the next day. *Al-Ahram* published a large photo about Horthy and the Hungarian Honorary General Consul on the front page.³⁷ On February 11 the newspaper mentioned that Ahmed Maher Pasha, the Egyptian Minister of Finance met Miklós Horthy junior in his office, where they discussed economic and commercial bilateral cooperation.³⁸ On April 30 *Al-Ahram* indicated that Hungarian regent's son and the sister of Károly travelled from Alexandria toward Hungary after a visit lasting for several weeks.³⁹

Sedky Pasha, the Egyptian Prime Minister's visit to Budapest

On February 2, 1932 the Egyptian authorities declared that the Hungarian government had the honor to invite the Prime Minister of Egypt to visit Budapest officially, in order to discuss bilateral relations between the two countries.⁴⁰ On February 26 *Al-Ahram* reported the following news: "The Consul of Hungary met

³³ "Commercial Deals between Egypt and Hungary - Miklós Horthy's efforts," *Al-Ahram* (1932/-), 6.

³⁴ "Hungarian Regent's Son is coming towards Egypt," *Al-Ahram* (1934/-), 4.

³⁵ "Horthy reached Alexandria, and the Hungarian General Honorary Consul honored his Reception," *Al-Ahram* (1934/17671), 1.

³⁶ "Hungarian Regent's Son," *Al-Ahram* (1938/-), 9.

³⁷ "Hungarian Regent's Son," *Al-Ahram* (1939/19542), 1.

³⁸ "Miklós Horthy met the Minister of Finance," *Al-Ahram* 1939/-, 08.

³⁹ "Hungarian Regent's Daughter," *Al-Ahram* 1939/19622, 1st page.

⁴⁰ "Egyptian Foreign Ministry's Archive," Cairo, 0075-050593, 2 February 1932. The Hungarian government invites the Prime Minister of Egypt to visit the Hungarian capital.

Ismail Sedky Pasha the day before yesterday and informed him that the Hungarian government bestowed him with the greatest scarf of merit, the highest medal of Hungary and only the Prime Minister of Italy received it before from the leaders of governments."⁴¹

On August 29, 1932 *Al-Ahram* reported in its political column that Sedky Pasha, the prime minister had traveled the previous morning to Geneva, heading to the Hungarian capital, Budapest, and this was the first visit of an Egyptian Prime Minister to Hungary after the First World War.⁴² The newspapers in Rome described the visit in detail. The reception of the Egyptian officials was favourable, the visit can be regarded as very successful.⁴³ In honor of the Prime Minister and his delegation Miklós Horthy, the regent of Hungary had made a dinner gala, and after the dinner, the Egyptian Prime Minister told reporters that the goal of the talks with the Hungarian officials was to strengthen the economic and commercial relations between the two countries and added that Egypt should export cotton to Hungary and the Egyptians would import industrial products from Hungary.⁴⁴

The relations between Egypt and Hungary were cut off during the Second World War. In February, 1942 Egypt declared its position of neutrality as a result of the British pressure on it and supported the British, at the same time Hungary stood with the Germans.

⁴¹ "The Hungarian government bestowed the prime minister with the greatest scarf of merit," *Al-Ahram* (1932/-), 6.

⁴² "Sedky Pasha in the Hungarian Capital," *Al-Ahram* (1932/-), 4.

⁴³ "Ismail Sedky Pasha's Visit to Hungary," *Al-Ahram* (1932/-), 2.

⁴⁴ "Sedky Pasha in the Hungarian Capital," *Al-Ahram* (1932/-), 6.

Cultural Cooperation between Hungary and Yugoslavia (1945–1948)

JÓZSEF N. SZABÓ



Continuing Past Connections

Hungary's relations with the Southern Slavonic peoples are rooted in history, similarly to their connections with their other neighbors. Many of the Serbian poets, writers and scientists grew up and were educated in Hungary. Most of the Serbian books produced in the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries were printed in Hungary. The great reformer of Serbian language and spelling, Vuk Karadjic, was bound to Hungarian culture by strong ties. Mihály Vitkovics was a Serbian and Hungarian poet at the same time. The creator of Serbian musical culture, Cornel Stankovic, was born in Buda and educated in Hungary. Western cultural influence was often relayed to Serbia through Hungary. Hungarian–Yugoslav relations were free of many of the adverse factors that burdened Hungary's relations with some other countries, because there were not serious animosities between Hungarians and Southern Slavonic peoples. The Serbians, for instance, had significant cultural associations, and a vivid intellectual life in Hungary. During World War I the activity of Serbian cultural life in Hungary, understandably, diminished. It was soon revitalized after the war.*

During World War II very serious tensions were generated between the two countries, mostly as a result of mistakes committed by Hungarian political and military leaders as well as by Serbian guerilla bands. These tensions, however, did not have a fatal and irreversible effect on postwar connections. Despite the fact that Yugoslavia finished the war as a victor and with a very high international prestige, the Yugoslav government did not exploit their superiority over Hungary, apart from several instances of retaliations and showdowns right after the end of the war. It was probably not a decisive factor in the attitude of the Yugoslav Government, but Hungarians also participated in the war of liberation conducted by the Yugoslav Communist Party, and it may have played some role in shaping Yugoslavia's policy in connection with Hungary. From December 1944, Tito's Yugoslavia was open to Hungarians, and no further retaliations were tolerated by the Yugoslav leadership. Thus Yugoslavia became receptive to the policy

* The history of the Hungarian–Yugoslav connections and the situation of the Hungarians in Yugoslavia are analyzed by Enikő A. Sajti in many of her books and studies.

developed by the political forces united in the Hungarian National Independence Front, declared to the general public by the Provisional National Government in Debrecen in December 1944. Hungary expressed her intentions to enter into good relationships with every democratic country, especially with those in the Carpathian Basin. Yugoslavia demonstrated the most encouraging attitude to the Hungarian initiatives.

In 1945, when Hungary was internationally isolated, the benevolence and tolerance of Yugoslavia to Hungary was not particularly overshadowed by past atrocities committed on both sides. Good Hungarian-Yugoslav relations were supported by the fact that Yugoslavia was the only one of the successor states of Austria-Hungary which provided cultural and political rights to the ethnic Hungarian minority.

The Foundations of the Good Relationships

Yugoslavia's policy contributed to the emerging cooperation of the nations of the Danube Valley right from the beginning. In this process the federation of Yugoslav communists played an outstandingly important role. The communist Yugoslav Government did not approve of retaliations, and any manifestation of national intolerance, but acknowledged and provided for the rights of the Hungarian national minority almost from the very end of the war. After the war Yugoslavia made efforts to improve and reinforce its relations with her neighbors. In her connections with Hungary, Yugoslavia did not emphasize the frictions and animosities of the past, but the necessity of establishing and reinforcing new connections, that would lead to cooperation between the two nations. Yugoslav domestic and foreign policy played a positive role in eliminating Hungary's international isolation.¹

Yugoslav cultural policy also contributed largely to the rapprochement of the two nations. From the aspect of spreading Hungarian culture and education it was of utmost importance that the situation of the Hungarian ethnic minority was satisfactory in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia ensured the conditions necessary for the development of the Hungarian press. In December 1944 Hungarian papers, journals and magazines were published in Újvidék. The social and cultural magazine *Híd* (*The Bridge*) had a circulation of 3,000–4,000, and *Ifjúság Szava* (*The Voice of the Youth*) was published in 10 thousand copies. The agricultural journal *Föld* (*The Land*), had a circulation of 5–7 thousand. In addition to all this, there was a Hungarian publishing house in Újvidék.²

In June 1945 the Hungarian Cultural Association in Yugoslavia, the largest autonomous Hungarian cultural and social organization, was established in Új-

¹ S. Balogh, *A népi demokratikus Magyarország külpolitikája 1945–1947*. [Foreign policy of Hungary, 1945–1947] Budapest 1982, 38.

² *Országgyűlés naplója*, I–III. Hiteles kiadás. Atheneum Irodalmi és Nyomdai Részevnytársulat Könyvkiadója, Budapest, 1948. [Journals of Parliament] II., 75.

vidék.³ The Cultural Association coordinated the work of the local organizations, book publishing and distribution, and the organization of literary events. The creation of the Cultural Association demonstrated that the pre-war era of oppression of Hungarians was finally replaced with equality. The activities of the Cultural Association were initially extended to the area of the province Vajdaság (Voivodina), but in the summer of 1947 it was granted nationwide authority. Thus it became possible to organize and develop Hungarian cultural centers in areas where it had previously not been possible.⁴ As a result of the policy of national equality, Hungarian schools and faculties were opened. It was in Yugoslavia where the situation of the Hungarian ethnic minority was the most satisfactory of all the successor states. Positive tendencies are clearly indicated by statistics: out of 7,600 people, one studied in Hungarian language at school in 1937, whereas in 1947 one out of 30 people was a Hungarian pupil or student studying in his or her native language.⁵ Between the two world wars Hungarians mostly had four-grade elementary schools. In the 1939–40 school year the Hungarians had 150 elementary schools with a total number of 25,255 pupils. Many of the Hungarian schools did not have Hungarian teachers, so although the school was officially regarded as a Hungarian one, the teachers hardly spoke any Hungarian. In the same academic year only one of the upper secondary schools had Hungarian sections, with a total number of 359 students and 10 Hungarian teachers. One of the teacher-training colleges of Belgrade had a Hungarian section, where three Hungarian teachers taught 57 students. Before 6 April, 1941, 15 new teachers graduated from this college. Right before World War II a total of 150 ethnic Hungarian teachers worked in the Vajdaság province.⁶

The lack of qualified teachers was one of the gravest problems in the field of culture in post-war Yugoslavia. They intended to solve the problem by launching regular training courses. 250 such courses were organized.⁷ In the 1945–46 academic year there were 732 Hungarian sections at the elementary schools, with a total of 34,782 pupils. The number of secondary schools also increased. There were 145 Hungarian sections in the 6 lower and 3 upper secondary schools, with 6,082 students. This figure is worth comparing with the 1939–40 statistics, when not more than 359 students learned at Hungarian secondary schools.⁸ In the 1946–47 academic year 9,364 students studied at the 49 lower and 3 upper secondary schools in Szabadka, Zenta and Nagybecskerek. In addition to this, there were two teacher training institutions in Szabadka and Újvidék with a total of 409 students, a teachers training college in Újvidék, a college of

³ *Magyarország történeti kronológiája*. [A historical chronology of Hungary] ed. F. Glatz, Vol. 4/II, Budapest 1982, 75–76.

⁴ *Journals of Parliament*, II, 76.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁶ I. Szeli, *A magyar kultúra útjai Jugoszláviában*. [The ways of Hungarian culture in Yugoslavia] Budapest 1983, 117.

⁷ *Journals of Parliament*, II, 74.

⁸ *Magyarország történeti kronológiája*, 4: 1023; Szeli, *A magyar kultúra útjai*, 117.

trade and commerce at Nagybecskerek, and an industrial and commercial vocational school in Szabadka.⁹

Besides education, theatrical life was also lively in postwar Yugoslavia. A positive feature of Yugoslav democracy was that the cultural rights granted to the minorities included that of celebrating the national holidays of the minorities concerned. In pre-war royal Yugoslavia these rights had only been partially granted. It had been, for instance, only allowed to organize amateur theatrical performances in some towns. After 1945 the ethnic Hungarians living in Yugoslavia had a government-subsidized theatre in Szabadka. The government provided an annual support of 2,5 million dinars (YUD) to the Hungarian theatres. The support was guaranteed by the Yugoslav Constitution, which did not only provide a possibility for a beginning, but also protected development once it had begun.¹⁰ It was as a result of this that Gyula Kállay was encouraged to write in the November 25, 1945 issue of *Szabad Föld* that the ethnic Hungarian minority in Yugoslavia had more rights after 1945 than ever before in its history.¹¹ Out of the 5,300 illiterate Hungarians 4,000 learned to read and write.¹² On May 16 the Skupstina (the Yugoslav Parliament) made a new effort to recognize and grant the rights of the Hungarian minority by involving two of their representatives in the work of the Parliament.¹³

Political Parties and Social Organizations

Hungary also took measures aimed at removing the barriers between the two countries. A pro-Yugoslav association was established in Szeged in April 1945, in order to promote friendship between the two countries and contribute to cultural cooperation in the Danube Valley. The members of the association believed that the Southeast of Europe constituted one cultural unit, it was essential to learn about the culture of our neighbors, especially that of the Serbians,¹⁴ in order to be able to live side by side as friends. The political parties appreciated the positive Yugoslav gestures. At the conference of the Hungarian Communist Party the exemplary initiatives by the Yugoslavs were warmly welcomed.¹⁵ The program of the National Peasants' Party also appreciated the measures Yugoslavia had taken on behalf of friendship and cultural development of the various nationalities living in the same region.¹⁶ *Kis Újság* (*The Small Paper*) of the Smallholders' Party published an article, according to which out of the countries of the Danube Val-

⁹ *Journals of Parliament*, II, 74.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 74.

¹¹ *Szabad Nép*, 25 November 1945.

¹² Szeli, *A magyar kultúra útjai*, 115–116.

¹³ *Nemzetgyűlés naplója*, I. Hiteles kiadás. Atheneum Irodalmi és Nyomdai Részvénytársulat Könyvkiadója, Budapest, 1946. *Journals of the National Assembly*, I, 39.

¹⁴ *Szabad Nép*, 13 April 1945.

¹⁵ *A Magyar Kommunista Párt és Szociáldemokrata Párt határozatai, 1944–1948*. [Decrees of the Hungarian Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party] Budapest 1967, 82.

¹⁶ Sándor Balogh–Lajos Izsák: *Pártok és pártprogramok Magyarországon: (1944–1948)*. [Parties and party programs in Hungary, 1944–1948] Budapest 1979, 226.

ley it was in Yugoslavia where Hungarians were treated with the warmest sympathy.¹⁷

A major milestone in the development of Hungarian-Yugoslav cultural relations was that a workers' choir of a hundred members and a Macedonian dance ensemble came to Budapest at the invitation of the Workers' Cultural Association.¹⁸ The Hungarian-Yugoslav Association, established on October 1 1945, played a dominant role in promoting and intensifying cooperation between the two countries. József Rex, Secretary General of the Association identified the most important elements of the mission of the new organization as follows: maintaining and further developing Hungarian-Yugoslav friendship and introducing Yugoslav culture, music and literature in Hungary. Rex and the leadership of the Association also wanted to establish close ties with the cultural organizations of Yugoslavia, especially with the Hungarian Cultural Federation. The goals of the Association also included the translation of Hungarian cultural products into the languages of Yugoslavia and their dissemination in the neighboring country.¹⁹

The Association had plans for publishing a journal. At the end of 1945, the Balkans Committee, originally established in 1940, started to work again. The Balkans Committee was resurrected in order to correctly inform the nations of the Balkans about the role of Hungary in World War II, and to present Hungary's new social, economic and cultural order to these countries.²⁰ The political and cultural rights guaranteed to the Hungarians in Yugoslavia provided a foundation for the relations of the two countries which was welcomed by all responsible politicians and which also served as a basis for an even more intensive relationship in the future. The next positive development was that on September 25, 1946, Yugoslavia entered into diplomatic relations with Hungary.

Yugoslavia's positive politics in relation to the ethnic Hungarians was not only appreciated by politicians in Hungary, but the general public also received this policy very favorably. Local branches of the Hungarian-Yugoslav Association were created at various points in Hungary. A local branch was established in Debrecen on 30 June 1947. Zoltán Tildy, President of the Republic of Hungary, and Karlo Mrázovic, Yugoslav Ambassador to Budapest appeared at the event, which indicated the importance both countries attributed to the friendship between them. The ambassador emphasized in his speech that Yugoslavia was committed to developing good relations between the two nations. This was the general Yu-

¹⁷ *Kis Újság*, 28 July 1945.

¹⁸ *Szabad Nép*, 25 September 1945; *Szabad Nép*, 30 September 1945.

¹⁹ Gyula Moór was the chairman of the Association. *Magyarország történeti kronológiája*, 1023; József Rex's letter to the Cultural Department of the Ministry of Education. Presented by Győző Vinnai in "A Magyar-Jugoszláv Társaság Története," [A history of the Hungarian-Yugoslav Society] *Tiszatáj* 36:2 (1982).

²⁰ Vinnai "A Magyar-Jugoszláv Társaság története"; idem "Adalékok a Magyar-Jugoszláv Társaság történetéhez," [Contribution to the Hungarian-Yugoslav Society] *Acta Nyíregyháziensis* (1987).

goslav approach experienced at all official occasions when the relationships of the two neighboring countries were discussed.²¹

In the second half of 1945 Hungarian cultural diplomacy regarded the creation of the conditions for the international introduction of new Hungarian culture as a priority. The Tildy Government that was established after the elections attributed special significance to connections between Hungary and her neighbors in the spirit of mutual understanding. In his speech delivered in the Parliament on November 30 the Prime Minister made it clear that the Hungarian Government had given up all former imperialistic politics once and for all, and would never lay claim to any privilege in the Carpathian Basin.²² Ferenc Nagy's Government that followed Tildy's cabinet also believed that the Republic of Hungary had really got rid of all chauvinistic attitudes of the past that had caused so much trouble, and the Hungarian nation was determined to find the ways leading to brotherly coexistence with the neighboring nations.²³

For all democratic parties in the government creating the conditions of friendship and cooperation with the neighboring countries was a top national priority. They therefore supported the efforts aimed at cooperation, and all parties in the coalition emphasized the importance of cooperation.²⁴ Hungarian cultural policy, open to the world, was to treat the relationship with the neighboring countries with preference. This is what Dezső Keresztúry pointed out in his press conference on February 9, 1946. He called the attention of his audience to the special attention Hungary needed to pay to expanding her cultural connections with foreign countries, especially with those in the Danube Valley.²⁵

Márton Horváth, on behalf of the Communist Party, made a emblematic contribution. In his belief cultural relationships with the neighboring countries were to be forged in the spirit of the fight against the false notion of "cultural superiority". Horváth found it possible to make efforts beneficial not only to Hungarians but also to their neighbors.²⁶ If ever put into practice, his ideas, involving a break away from the negative approaches of the past and taking mutual advantages and national interests into consideration, would have largely contributed to a high standard of cooperation in the Danube Valley.

Essays in the column "Jószomszédság" (Good Neighborhood) of the periodical *Emberség* (Humanity) indicated the attention focused on Central Europe. The magazine, unfortunately, did not have a long life. Similar writings appeared in *Újszántás* (Freshly Ploughed Land).²⁷ An important step in the process of Hungary's approach to its neighbors was that the Government accepted a proposal put for-

²¹ *Magyarország történeti kronológiája*, 1030; *Szabad Nép*, 1 July 1947.

²² *Journals of the National Assembly*, I, 23–25.

²³ *Ibid.*, 370.

²⁴ *Journals of the National Assembly*, I, 82, 90, 406, 450; *Népszava*, 13 January 1946; *Kis Újság*, 30 January 1946; *Népszava*, 20 January 1946.

²⁵ *Szabadság*, 10 February 1946.

²⁶ *Szabad Nép*, 12 May 1946.

²⁷ *A magyar irodalom története, 1945–1975*. [A history of Hungarian Literature, 1945–1975] ed. M. Béládi et al. 4 vols. Budapest 1981–1990, 1: 72.

ward by István Balogh, Under-Secretary of State, regarding the education of national minorities on 5 January 1946. According to the new resolution, members of national minorities were to receive their education in their own native tongue.²⁸

The Results of the Cooperation

The Hungarian Government appreciated the friendly gestures of Yugoslavia, which not only took the interests of the ethnic Hungarians into account, but also paid attention to Hungarian culture in general. On the Hungarian side, these gestures were regarded as a token of good partnership. The democratic Hungarian parties believed that cooperation was not simply fruitful for both nations, but that they were destined to cooperation, as without it neither one was able to survive and prosper.²⁹

After the war literature was the field of culture that was able to introduce a nation to another in the most efficient way. Its importance was recognized by Hungarian authors who raised their voice against factors that hampered cooperation between neighboring nations. They emphasized the common fate of Hungary and Yugoslavia when they condemned those who spoiled the relationships between the two nations in a chauvinistic way. At a meeting of the Board of the Hungarian Writers Association, in January 1946, Lajos Zilahy requested the Board to present a draft resolution at the next Board meeting in order to denounce and condemn reactionary and chauvinistic operations.³⁰

At an exceptionally interesting afternoon concert, organized at his home, Dezső Keresztúry emphasized that Hungarians and Southern Slavs finally found the way leading to each other. A gala concert at the Academy of Music was also put in the service of expanding Hungarian-Yugoslav friendship and cooperation. Field Marshall Tito's declaration of April 1946, in which he talked about his sympathy to Hungarians, was regarded as an expression of confidence and friendship.³¹ The Hungarian press paid special attention to Hungarian-Yugoslav relations. The newspapers wrote about the development of the bilateral connections, and published positive opinions about Yugoslavia where the possibilities of education and social progress were open for the Hungarian minority.³²

Hungary also took steps in order to improve the cultural possibilities and facilities of the Croatian and Serbian minorities living in her territory. In the field of settling the educational issues of national minorities the first thing to be accomplished was to provide for the native language education of the Southern Slavs,

²⁸ *Kis Újság*, 8 January 1946; *Magyar Közlöny*, 1946, no. 12.

²⁹ *Journals of the National Assembly*, I, 25; *Szabad Nép*, 25 November 1945. The importance of the Hungarian-Yugoslav cultural connections is indicated by the fact that five out of the scholarships offered by the National scholarship Council on 23 August, 1945, were for Yugoslavia. *Magyar Közlöny*, 1945, no. 108; The Ministry of Education offered 8 scholarships in Yugoslavia in the 1945-46 academic year. *Ideiglenes Nemzetgyűlés Naplója*, 1945, p. 41.

³⁰ *Szabadság*, 19 January 1946; *Kis Újság*, 3 March 1946.

³¹ *Kis Újság*, 27 February 1946; *Szabadság*, 14 March 1946; *Szabadság*, 3 April 1946.

³² *Szabadság*, 31 March 1946; *Szabadság*, 17 April 1946.

who had demonstrated friendship and loyalty to Hungary. Native language education was going on in 48 schools in 1946. The Minister of Education Dezső Keresztúry made the utmost efforts to solve the question of minority education in a fair and democratic way.³³

The good connections between Hungary and Yugoslavia made it possible that the first bilateral cultural agreement Hungary entered into was made with the Vajdaság (Voivodina) province of Yugoslavia, mostly populated by Hungarians. Radivoy Badidovic's non-official visit to Hungary was intended to improve cultural cooperation between the two nations. The head of the Department of Education of the Vajdaság wished to obtain a first-hand impression about the situation of culture and education in Hungary, thus contributing to the cultural connections between the two countries. Introduction of Southern Slavonic literature in Hungary also began in 1946. Gyula Illyés wrote an essay about the poet of international reputation, and a martyr of the partisan war, Ivan Goran Kovacic, in the literary journal *Válasz (Answer)*. Zoltán Csuka undertook the task of introducing Southern Slavonic literature to the Hungarian readers. László Hadrovics wrote a book about the history of Yugoslavia, entitled *A szerb nép és egyházak a török uralom alatt (The Serbian People and Churches under the Turkish Rule)*. The book was published by the Teleki Institute.³⁴

The Hungarian-Yugoslav relations were positively evaluated by politicians and journalists alike. It was natural that the press of the HCP wrote about Yugoslavia in an appreciative manner. The January 28, 1947, issue of *Szabad Nép*, for instance, wrote about the immense cultural program Hungary's southern neighbor implemented among the ethnic Hungarians.³⁵ The Foreign Minister (Smallholders' Party) János Gyöngyösi, not surprisingly, first talked about Yugoslavia in his speech in Parliament on March 20, 1947. The head of Hungarian diplomacy found it important to pay special attention to Yugoslavia because its southern neighbor was determined to exclude disturbing elements of the past from the new bilateral relations and place emphasis on cooperation. Special relationships with Yugoslavia served as a model for Hungary's connections with other countries, in which the situation was not always satisfactory, and sometimes definitely a poor one.³⁶ Dezső Sulyok, an MP of the Liberty Party, also evaluated Hungarian-Yugoslav connections in an advantageous way.³⁷

The press continued to publish positive articles about Yugoslavia. *Szabad Nép* wrote about Hungarian-Yugoslav friendship for the umpteenth time on April 20, asking for further expansion of economic, cultural and political connections.³⁸

³³ *Szabadság*, 13 February 1946; *Szabadság*, 4 April 1946.

³⁴ *Szabadság*, 7 September 1946; *A magyar irodalom története, 1945–1975*, 1: 70; D. Kosáry, "The Idea of a Comparative History of East Central Europe: the Story of a Venture," in D. Deletant, H. Hanak, eds, *Historians as Nation-Builders: Central and South-East Europe*, London, 1988, 135.

³⁵ *Szabad Nép*, 28 January 1947.

³⁶ *Journals of the National Assembly*, VII, 49.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 20.

³⁸ *Szabad Nép*, 10 April 1947.

According to the April 20 issue of *Szabad Nép*, Hungarian-Yugoslav cultural relations entered a new phase of mutual understanding in which the foundations of long-term prospective connections and close cooperation were to be laid down.³⁹

Hungarian political forces appreciated Yugoslavia's positive attitude to Hungary and spoke very positively of the cultural and political rights granted by the Yugoslav Government to the ethnic Hungarians. Ambassador Zoltán Szántó spoke on the Hungarian radio in July 1947 and expressed his belief that ethnic Hungarians in the Vajdaság were not threatened by Slavonification, as their cultural rights were protected, and they were represented in public life and local politics in accordance with their number. He mentioned as an example that 50,000 ethnic Hungarian children learned at schools in their own native language, and the cultural life of Hungarians was full.⁴⁰

One of the most important tasks of the Hungarian Government was cultivating the friendship that developed between Hungary and Yugoslavia. Gyula Ortutay therefore travelled to Belgrade on July 22, 1947 in order to make preparations for the Hungarian-Yugoslav cultural agreement. As there was no major conflict between the parties, they planned to sign the agreement in August of the same year.⁴¹ This, however, did not take place, but the relationship between the two countries remained successful. It is exemplified in a speech by Lajos Dinnyés in Parliament on October 7, 1947, in which Dinnyés used the warmest words about Yugoslavia, where Hungarians were fully encouraged to use their political rights.⁴² This opinion of the Prime Minister was not a mere formality, as he did not speak equally positively about Romania in the same speech.

Signing and Ratifying the Cultural Agreement

The agreement governing Hungarian-Yugoslav cultural relations was signed on October 15, 1947, when a government delegation, led by the Prime Minister, travelled to Belgrade. The agreement, set out in Hungarian and Serbo-Croatian languages was signed by Erik Molnár on behalf of Hungary, and Marjau Stilinovic on behalf of Yugoslavia. The cultural agreements made in the autumn and winter of 1947 were primarily the results of the "shaping" uniform interests of the people's democracies, manifested in Cominform. The Hungarian-Yugoslav agreement was an exception to this, and the agreement itself was different from the other such contracts as it was based upon good relations of pre-war times and was a culmination of a successful cooperation. As it had been worded well before the foundation of Cominform that took place on October 7, 1947, Cominform interests were not directly incorporated into the text. It was therefore not so "over-ideologized" and "over-politicized" as many other agreements of those times. It is therefore justified to state that the Hungarian-Yugoslav Cultural Agreement was a "normal" document of cultural diplomacy, rooted in the good relationships

³⁹ *Szabad Nép*, 20 April 1947.

⁴⁰ *Szabad Nép*, 13 July 1947.

⁴¹ *Szabad Nép*, 23 July 1947.

⁴² *Journals of Parliament*, I, 46.

between the two countries from 1945 to 1948, and one which included realistic objectives. In the case of this agreement it was not necessary to conceal contradictions for ideological reasons dictated by the alleged unity of the people's democracies, it was not necessary to idealize the relations for political-ideological aspects. Post-war realities and the spirit of the agreement were not in contradiction.

The governments of Hungary and Yugoslavia entered into the agreement in order to improve good relationships between their nations, to learn about each other's culture. This document was based upon good bilateral connections and mutual good will. The agreement consisted of 6 articles. In Article 1 the Parties declared that they would mutually treat each other with the warmest good will and courtesy in the field of scientific, literary and cultural connections. Article 2 proposed setting up cultural institutes in order to learn more about each other's culture. In Article 3 the Parties agreed to set up a Joint Committee for the implementation of the objectives set forth in the agreement. The Committee, consisting of a Hungarian and a Yugoslav section, was to have two headquarters: one in Budapest and one in Belgrade. Representatives of the most important cultural, political and scientific organizations were delegated to the Hungarian section, together with the leaders of the cultural and educational institutions of the ethnic Southern Slavonic population living in Hungary. In accordance with the agreement, the Committee was to have meetings as needed, but at least twice a year, in towns mutually agreed upon alternately in Yugoslavia and Hungary. Article 4 specified the tasks of the Joint Committee. The tasks included preparing proposals to the two governments. The responsibility of the governments, in turn, was to take the necessary steps in their own countries in the shortest possible time. Article 5 contained the tasks and responsibilities of the joint subcommittees. One of the priorities was establishing university and college departments of philology, history, geography, sciences and in every other field that was expected to contribute to learning more about the other party.

The Agreement contained enclosures regarding the exchange of researchers, teachers and students, and supporting training going on in all school types, granting scholarships, and promoting the cooperation of scientific, scholarly and educational institutions in the two countries. The Agreement also provided for the support of students' studies in the other country. In order to achieve that, they proposed contracts that were to regulate the mutual acceptance of entrance examinations, secondary and higher education certificates and academic degrees. Hungary and Yugoslavia intended to make it possible for their researchers and scholars to visit institutions in each other's countries. The Agreement proposed the continual exchange of publications in sciences, scholarly studies, culture and arts. Supporting the contacts between educational institutions, libraries and public collections in the two countries were also included in the objectives of the Agreement.

Parties to the Agreement committed themselves to promoting the translation of works in sciences, arts and literature, and to the mutual protection of copyrights and royalties. The two countries attributed great importance to making the exchange of art exhibitions, theatrical exhibitions, movie films, audio recordings

and radio programs easier. In order to know and understand each other better, a paragraph of Article 5 dealt with excursions and sports events in each other's countries. The Parties committed themselves to establishing press agencies in their own territories for the press and radio of the other country. The point of the agreement that declared that Parties would make efforts to support the culture of the national minorities living in their territories was particularly important. Article 6 declared that the agreement was to be confirmed as soon as possible, and the documents of ratification were to be exchanged in Budapest. The next step was to request the registration of the agreement at the secretariat of the United Nations Organization. The agreement was to come into effect on the date when the documents were exchanged and was to remain in effect for five years. If neither party terminated the agreement in writing at least six months before its expiry date, it was to remain in effect for another five years, then for another five years until one of the parties intended to terminate it.⁴³

Signing and ratifying the agreement took place after the Cominform had come into being, so the Hungarian-Yugoslav Cultural Agreement was given an ideological dimension, similarly to other cultural agreements made between people's democracies, but it was only observed in the press, and did not affect the agreement itself. On October 16, *Szabad Nép* wrote that the agreement not only connected intellectual people to each other and served the purpose of cultural cooperation, but it was a means for working people in Hungary and Yugoslavia to become better acquainted with each other's progressive and class-conscious traditions as well.⁴⁴

On December 3, 1947 Foreign Minister Erik Molnár put forth the Hungarian-Yugoslav Cultural Agreement, signed in Belgrade on November 15 of the same year, for ratification in Parliament. On December 4 Géza Losonczy submitted the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee.⁴⁵ Losonczy, in his speech, welcomed the agreement as one serving the interests of "people's democracy." In his opinion one of the priorities of the young Hungarian democracy should be cooperation and alliance with the progressive forces in the world in order to preserve and reinforce peace and democracy.⁴⁶ Géza Losonczy, who made his speech on December 5, also pointed out that the Hungarian-Yugoslav Cultural Agreement was to be a link in a chain of agreements.⁴⁷ On the same day, Marton Horváth emphasized the priority of political aspects. He first gave voice to his conviction that the Parliament rarely saw bills that met a uniform and univocal acceptance as the one the Hungarian-Yugoslav Cultural Agreement did. He believed that the agreement expressed the wish of the people of Hungary. In that he was right, but the Communist politician found the agreement primarily important from the aspect

⁴³ UMKL-XIX-I-1e. 1947-158213; The Hungarian-Yugoslav Cultural Agreement was signed in Belgrade on 15 October 1947. *Diplomáciai és nemzetközi jogi lexikon*. [Lexicon of diplomacy and international law] Budapest 1967, 466.

⁴⁴ *Szabad Nép*, 16 October 1947.

⁴⁵ *Journals of Parliament*, II, 72.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 78.

of the emerging people's democracy. Horváth regarded the agreement as the first step leading to a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance. In his opinion the agreement was to radically change Hungary's foreign political positions.⁴⁸

In addition to the communist politician, representatives of other parties also told their opinion about the agreement. György Lupkovits, on behalf of Smallholders' Party, warmly welcomed the agreement.⁴⁹ József Fischler, a social democratic politician made a speech on December 5. In his opinion, the House was discussing an agreement, the importance of which was rooted in history and cultural history, rather than in politics or people's democracy. In this situation the responsibility of the Parliament was eliminating all obstacles from the way of the two neighboring nations' rapprochement. He expressed his conviction that the agreement ensured undisturbed cultural relations between the two countries.⁵⁰

Pál Szabó joined those who emphasized the historic significance of the agreement. The politician of the Peasants Party pointed out that the Parliament had the opportunity to make up for a-hundred-year-old mistakes.⁵¹ Sándor Bálint, on behalf of the Democratic People's Party also supported the agreement. The well-known professor of ethnography also warned that there was still a lot to be done in the field of revealing connections between the two nations in ethnography and history. Bálint declared that the Democratic People's Party was ready and willing to support all initiatives that served the improvement of Hungary's relations with the neighboring countries, and through it, the benefit of the ethnic Hungarians living beyond the borders of Hungary.⁵²

Antal Rab, in his comments, also answered the remarks of Sándor Bálint regarding the situation of the ethnic Hungarians. The Communist MP believed that the cultural agreement would contribute to the cultural development of Hungarians living in Yugoslavia and that of the Southern Slavs living in Hungary. The point of the agreement the speaker found particularly important was the one related to the educational facilities and possibilities of the Hungarians in Yugoslavia and the Southern Slavs in Hungary.⁵³

Erik Molnár also made a speech in the parliamentary discussion of the agreement on December 5. According to the Foreign Minister, the purpose of the agreement was in serving the cultural rapprochement of the two countries, eliminating former animosities, making it possible for nations to learn more about each other.⁵⁴ Among the communist politicians who disclosed their opinion about the document, Erik Molnár was one of the few who did not approach the agreement in an exaggeratedly over-politicized way. He also pointed out that the agreement had a political dimension, but he approached the issue from the side of the ethnic Hungarians living in the Vajdaság. Here Erik Molnár explained why

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 86-87.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*, 93.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

Yugoslavia was the first country with which Hungary made an agreement. The reason was that it was in Yugoslavia where the ethnic, civilian and political rights of the Hungarians were provided for in the most advanced way, and the possibilities of development were ensured for the Hungarians in this country.⁵⁵ This was also the reason why all parties in the Hungarian Parliament supported the agreement.

President Tito's visit to Hungary on December 6, 1947 was an important milestone in the development of good Hungarian-Yugoslav relations.⁵⁶ As communist politicians regarded the cultural agreement as a foundation for a treaty of friendship, it was not surprising that the Committee of Foreign Affairs submitted to the Parliament the Hungarian-Yugoslav Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance for ratification on January 9, 1948. The Treaty was signed in Budapest on December 1947.⁵⁷

After signing the Treaty with Yugoslavia, some events representing the friendship of the two nations took place. Such was the invitation of Southern Slavonic dance and song ensembles to the final of the national folk music competition, organized by the Hungarian Cultural Association. An exhibition entitled "Work and Class Struggle in Yugoslavia" was opened in Pécs on May 9, 1948. A Yugoslav play was staged in Szeged in May. In May and June Serbian politicians and authors were celebrated in Hungary.⁵⁸ This friendship was important for Yugoslavia as well. The papers published articles about the War of Independence in 14 columns.⁵⁹ Hungary demonstrated the exemplary connections with Yugoslavia by conferring the Hungarian Order of the Republic upon Deputy Prime Minister Eduard Kardelj, and Foreign Minister Staneje Simic.⁶⁰

The relationship in 1948 appeared to be problem-free. There was no indication that the most fruitful cooperation in the Carpathian Basin would soon be disrupted and the two countries would look upon each other as desperate enemies, as a result of a new policy dictated by the Soviet Union, through the "resolutions" of Cominform and its consequences in Hungary.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 98.

⁵⁶ *Szabad Nép*, 7 December 1947.

⁵⁷ *Journals of Parliament*, II, 367.

⁵⁸ Institute of Political Studies (PTI) Arch. 274. f. 21/71.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Magyar Közlöny*, 1948, nos. 133-134.

Discorde chez les Pieds Noirs

Les partis dans l'Algérie française, 1945-1954

PETER ÁKOS FERWAGNER



Introduction

L'historiographie de l'Algérie coloniale a encore des dettes à payer. Lors de mes recherches, j'ai constaté que le problème mentionné dans le titre, l'étude de l'attitude politique et des préférences de la population européenne (« les Pieds Noirs ») après la deuxième guerre mondiale mérite l'attention. Cette époque conduisant directement à la guerre d'indépendance de 1954-62, la conduite de la société des colons européens des années 1940-50 peut contribuer à expliquer l'éclatement du conflit armé. Je voudrais donc passer en revue l'histoire, le fonctionnement, les objectifs, les résultats électoraux, finalement la popularité des sections algériennes des partis français, encore peu connus dans l'historiographie.

Pour la rédaction de mon étude, j'ai utilisé deux types de sources. Le premier se compose des rapports et des bulletins sur l'activité des forces politiques différentes préparés par le département spécial du Gouvernement général d'Alger pour le gouverneur général et, au niveau départemental, pour les préfets.¹ Ces matériaux sont pratiquement indispensables à l'élaboration du sujet ; malheureusement une grande partie des dossiers ne sont pas encore communicables dans les Archives d'Outre-Mer (AOM) à Aix-en-Provence. Certes, plusieurs dossiers seront ouverts aux recherches dans les années prochaines. Le deuxième type des sources est la presse algérienne des partis politiques, qui donne des informations riches sur la vie des partis, sur les programmes et les campagnes électorales.² La presse de ces sections est tout à fait accessible et consultable. A cause du caractère du sujet, la méthode de travail était forcément celle de la politologie et de l'histoire politique. J'ai examiné avant tout le fonctionnement algérien, le recrutement, les débats internes des partis et leurs relations avec les musulmans. J'ai

¹ J.-Ch. Jauffret, « Algérie 1945-1954 : les exemples de décolonisation vus par les services de renseignement français, » in *Décolonisations européennes. Actes du colloque international « Décolonisation comparées »*, Aix-en-Provence, 30 septembre - 3 octobre 1993. Aix-en-Provence 1995.

² PCA : *L'Humanité* ; SFIO : *Fraternité* ; RGR : *Algérie radicale, Démocratie* ; MRP : *La Quatrième République - Forces nouvelles* ; RPF : *Le Rassemblement d'Algérie*.

consacré une grande attention aux campagnes électorales et aux débats constitutionnels.

Dans l'historiographie sur le sujet, l'opinion générale est que les partis européens (excepté le Parti communiste algérien, le PCA) ont formé un camp politique pratiquement uni et homogène dans lequel il n'y avait guère de désaccords. Plusieurs auteurs représentent la société européenne d'Algérie comme une unité monolithique, et les objectifs des partis comme identiques. J'émet une hypothèse selon laquelle cette image est plus nuancée : de temps en temps, parmi les forces politiques se sont déroulé des luttes acharnées dans notre époque étudiée. Il y eut parfois des discordes très vives chez les Pieds Noirs.

Le point de départ est le soulèvement de l'Algérie de l'Est en mai 1945³, car cet événement a prouvé que les cercles gouvernementaux et les partis français tenaient au régime colonial, qu'ils n'ont pas accepté de tolérer la séparation de la colonie la plus importante, et qu'ils ont agi par tous les moyens contre les mouvements nationaux. Le soulèvement était définitif pour le mouvement national aussi, car – pour des nombreux nationalistes – la lutte armée était devenue la seule méthode possible pour forcer la France à accepter l'indépendance de l'Algérie.

Quant à l'étude des partis, on peut diviser notre époque en trois périodes. Dans la première étape, les élections municipales et législatives, les débats constitutionnels de 1945-46, et les luttes politiques de 1947 sur la loi organique d'Algérie ont caractérisé la vie publique. En avril 1948, les élections de la nouvelle Assemblée algérienne ont fermé la formation du système institutionnel défini par la loi organique. C'est une étape très intensive, pleine des campagnes, des élections et des référendums. Pendant cette époque-là, les tendances politiques définissant plus tard la politique des partis sont apparues (par ex., les projets du SFIO, les aspirations à l'indépendance du PCA, la coopération et la coalition de la droite pour les succès électoraux).

La deuxième étape dure de 1948 à 1951. C'est une période plus calme que les années antérieures ayant une atmosphère tendue à l'extrême. Les partis ont cherché leurs places dans le cadre de la légalité coloniale et ont discuté sur les modalités de l'exécution de la loi organique. La question des réformes était toujours présente, autour desquelles les luttes de parti ont culminé. Dans la droite, il y avait des conflits aigus sur la politique musulmane et des tensions sérieuses sont apparues dans chacun des partis entre la direction métropolitaine et les sections algériennes. Cette période est fermée par les élections législatives de 1951 où – comme auparavant – les autorités ont commis beaucoup d'infractions dans le deuxième collège électoral formé pour les autochtones afin d'empêcher l'accession des candidats nationalistes à l'Assemblée nationale de Paris.

Dans la dernière étape, suite à l'accélération du processus de décolonisation et à l'escalade des crises coloniaux (Indochine, Tunisie, Maroc), dans la droite européenne les désaccords internes ont cessé, les partis ont concentré sur le maintien de la situation actuelle et ils se sont bercés d'illusions que les réformes étaient

³ Radouane Ainad Tabet, *Le mouvement du 8 mai 1945 en Algérie*. Alger 1985.

importunes en cette Algérie calme. La guerre éclatée à la fin de 1954 peut être considérée aussi comme une réponse à cette politique conservatrice des partis et à la conduite sans compromis des colons. Évidemment l'éclatement du conflit armé a été inspiré dans une large mesure par la capitulation des Français en Indochine ainsi que les événements tunisiens et marocains.

Les querelles politiques en 1945-48

En été 1945, l'union « sacrée » des partis de la Résistance antifasciste a éclaté et des débats très durs ont commencé sur le futur politique, économique et constitutionnel de la France. Cependant, en Algérie, on pouvait constater le maintien, même la renaissance de cette « union sacrée » contre le soulèvement du mai 1945 qui a été condamné sévèrement par tous les partis y compris les communistes.⁴ Cette attitude des partis a reflété l'animosité de la population européenne envers les revendications des nationalistes et, dans une certaine mesure, sa peur hystérique de « l'abandon de l'Algérie française » par la métropole. Les partis ont soutenu la politique du gouvernement du général de Gaulle (celle de l'écrasement de la révolte), c'est pourquoi les relations des mouvements nationalistes et des partis européens de la gauche se sont détériorées irrémédiablement.

Dans les débats constitutionnels, les colonies et l'Algérie lui-même ont reçu un rôle non négligeable. En automne 1945, on a tenu des élections législatives dans « les trois départements d'outre-mer » aussi où le PCA a obtenu dans le premier collège le 25 % des votes,⁵ ainsi, avec la SFIO, le soutien électoral de la gauche a abordé le 50 % (46 %) qui était justement le même qu'en métropole.⁶ Cela veut dire que la société européenne ne votait pas *a priori* à droite : en cas de l'existence d'un parti de gauche qui ne contestait pas les droits des colons (p. ex. le PCA, la SFIO), elle a donné volontiers sa voix à cette formation politique.

Les députés du premier collège dans la première Assemblée constituante (1945-46)⁷

Partis	Alger	Oran	Constantine
Communistes	Pierre Fayet, Paul Tubert	Alice Sportisse, Camille Larribère	-
Socialistes	-	Maurice Rabier	Raoul Borra
Républicains indépendants	-	François Quilici	Deyron
MRP	Paul-Émile Viard, Marcel Ribère	Marcel Gatuing	-
Radicaux	Auguste Rencurel	-	Paul Cuttoli

⁴ A. Chebel d'Appollonia, *Histoire politique des intellectuels en France 1944-1954*. Tome II. *Le Temps de l'engagement*. Paris 1991, 217-218.

⁵ E. Sivan, *Communisme et nationalisme en Algérie 1920-1962*. Paris 1976, 124.

⁶ *Année politique 1944-45. Revue chronologique des principaux faits politiques, économiques et sociaux de la libération de Paris au 31 Décembre 1945*. Paris 1946, 150.

⁷ *L'Écho d'Alger*, le 25 octobre 1945.

Comme la gauche a gagné la majorité absolue des voix dans la métropole, elle avait la possibilité d'élaborer le premier projet de la nouvelle Constitution. Tous les deux partis ouvriers, le PCA et la SFIO ont encouragé l'introduction des réformes sérieuses (p. ex. les socialistes voulaient créer le système électoral au collège uni qui aurait pu avoir des conséquences immenses concernant le futur politique de l'Algérie).⁸ Mais la droite et les radicaux très populaires et très influents parmi les Pieds Noirs ont repoussé avec dédain ces initiatives.⁹ Ce premier projet constitutionnel a été enfin rejeté par la population française des trois départements d'outre-mer (186 000 non contre 175 000 oui)¹⁰ qui était en même temps le premier signe du rapprochement lent de cette société avec la droite. Tout cela est devenu évident aux élections législatives du juin 1946. Les communistes et les socialistes ont perdu des voix, tandis que la droite s'est affermie¹¹.

En été 1946, le PCA a adopté la cause de l'indépendance du pays et dans la période suivante il l'a défendue conséquemment. Son autre initiative a visé la création du front d'union des partis nationalistes afin de pouvoir engager une lutte plus effective contre le colonisateur. Il y avait des débats vifs dans les autres partis aussi (particulièrement parmi les socialistes), mais, en effet, la volonté de garder les colonies l'a emporté. Le deuxième projet constitutionnel élaboré en automne n'a pas contenu déjà le droit de la sécession de l'Union française, et l'Algérie a persisté à constituer la partie intégrante de la métropole. La nouvelle Constitution adoptée par le référendum d'octobre a fait une concession à avoir imposé un statut spécial pour les territoires d'outre-mer différents. Il faut noter que les territoires d'outre-mer, comme auparavant, ont voté contre le projet constitutionnel.¹² Aux élections parlementaires, les partis de la droite se sont encore renforcés.

*Les députés du premier collège dans l'Assemblée nationale (novembre 1946)*¹³

Partis	Alger	Oran	Constantine
Communistes	Pierre Fayet	Alice Sportisse	-
Socialistes	-	Maurice Rabier	Raoul Borra
<i>Républicains indépendants</i>	Fernand Chevalier, Jacques Chevallier	François Quilici	Paul Pantaloni
MRP	Paul-Émile Viard	Serre	Jacques Augarde
Radicaux	Auguste Rencurel	Jeanmot	René Mayer
PRL	Adolphe Aumeran	-	-

Italique : les forces politiques unies dans le « Rassemblement républicain » de droite

⁸ R. Quillot, *La SFIO et l'exercice du pouvoir 1944-1958*. Paris 1972, 147, 150-152.

⁹ *L'Écho d'Alger*, le 26 avril 1946 ; *Algérie radicale*, le 3 mai 1946 ; *Année politique* 1946, 75.

¹⁰ *Fraternité*, le 9 mai 1946.

¹¹ *Année politique* 1946, 150.

¹² V.-A. Montassier, *Les années d'après-guerre 1944-1949*. Paris 1980, 121.

¹³ *L'Écho d'Alger*, les 10-11 novembre 1946.

Pendant le débat de 1947 sur la loi organique, toutes les forces politiques ont exprimé en détail leur avis sur le futur de l'Algérie. Le débat était le plus vif autour le système électoral algérien. La question s'est posée ainsi : comment le système reflète la proportion ethnique et/ou religieuse de la population ? Étant donné que la population musulmane était majoritaire de 7:1/8:1 par rapport les européens, le système proportionnel aurait été favorable aux autochtones. C'est pourquoi, sous la pression des colons, les partis ont adopté en septembre 1947 une loi en vertu de laquelle le pays, formant un groupe de départements, est demeuré partie intégrante de la France, et le système électoral à deux collèges a été maintenu.¹⁴ En vertu de ce statut, toutes les lois métropolitaines étaient en vigueur en Algérie. On a bien créé un « parlement » algérien, mais cette Assemblée ne pouvait s'occuper que des affaires financières et économiques, et de l'introduction des réformes absolument non radicales inscrites par la loi fondamentale. Cette loi de statut a été refusée par les deux communautés. Les musulmans avaient attendu plus tandis que les européens ont considéré les réformes trop exagérées, et ils avaient peur de la suppression de leurs privilèges. Plus tard, l'inutilité de l'inquiétude et de l'angoisse des européens se sont vérifiées.

Les cadres de la période suivante était tracés par les élections de l'Assemblée algérienne fixées au printemps de 1948. Les autorités coloniales se sont efforcées d'empêcher les hommes politiques nationalistes de gagner un mandat. Pour les besoins de la cause, elles ont commis une série des infractions, et elles ont atteint la victoire des candidats « indépendants » acceptant sans critique la présence française (les « béni-oui-oui »). Plus tard, le gouverneur général, le socialiste Marcel-Edmond Naegelen n'a pas caché qu'il avait « donné des instructions... pour que les élections à l'Assemblée algérienne n'amènent pas une majorité messaliste au deuxième collège... Nous avons été obligés, non pas de faire régner la terreur, mais de briser une terreur qui régnait sur le pays ».¹⁵ En effet, il n'y avait que peu de candidats nationalistes qui pouvaient accéder à l'Assemblée algérienne. Guy Mollet, le secrétaire général du parti SFIO a déclaré au lendemain du scrutin : « Si les élections avaient été libérées de la tutelle administrative, Messali [le chef du parti nationaliste MTLD - PAF] aurait recueilli 80 % des voix. »¹⁶ En ce qui concerne les européens, les forces ont l'emporté qui ont refusé la loi organique et ont exigé son aggravation, son resserrement : l'Union algérienne et RPF gaulliste. A ce compte-là, dans l'Assemblée algérienne une majorité s'est formée qui a empêché l'entrée en vigueur des réformes sérieuses dans le pays.

¹⁴ Les Français de souche et quelques catégories de la population musulmane pouvait voter dans le premier collège tandis que les masses des indigènes dans le deuxième collège. Les deux collèges avaient autant des représentants à l'Assemblée nationale et, plus tard, en Assemblée algérienne.

¹⁵ M.-E. Naegelen, *Mission en Algérie*. Paris 1962, 63 et sq.

¹⁶ Quilliot, *La SFIO et l'exercice du pouvoir 1944-1958*, 266.

Composition de l'Assemblée algérienne (1948)

	Alger	Oran	Constan- tine	Territoires du Sud	Total
Premier collège					
Communistes	-	1	-	-	1
SFIO	1	3	-	-	4
Radicaux-socialistes	-	-	2	-	2
Radicaux indépendants	1	-	-	-	1
Indépendants	2	3	8	1	14
Union algérienne et RPF	19	13	6	-	38
Total					60
Deuxième collège					
MTLD	3	-	5	1	9
UDMA	-	2	6	-	8
Communistes	-	-	-	-	-
Indépendants	14	12	13	4	43
Total					60

La deuxième étape de l'évolution des partis

Entre 1948 et 1951, les luttes animées des années précédentes se sont apaisées. Cependant, les partis ont continué leur combat pour la réalisation de leur programme, pour l'élargissement de leur base de masse. Les communistes ont exigé de plus en plus radicalement l'indépendance de l'Algérie et la création d'un nouveau système social. Même, ils n'ont pas abandonné leurs intentions de persuader les nationalistes de l'action commune (la pensée du « Front uni »). Mais les partis nationalistes ont toujours refusé cette initiative alléguant des prétextes différents. Le MTLD de Messali Hadj a reproché au parti communiste son attitude pendant le soulèvement de l'Algérie de l'Est, tandis que l'UDMA de Ferhat Abbas a blâmé le PCA pour sa politique extérieure prosoviétique. Il est vrai que les communistes ont glorifié l'URSS et l'ont soutenue. Au septembre 1948, le groupement d'Oran de l'Association Algérienne des Amis de l'URSS, une organisation proche des communistes, a fait apposer un tract où on a relevé notamment le passage suivant : « L'Union Soviétique, Etat Multinational, a seule résolu la question coloniale, en donnant aux différentes nationalités le droit de s'administrer et de gérer leurs propres affaires dans le cadre de leurs traditions et coutumes. »¹⁷ Bien entendu, dans la guerre froide le PCA devait lutter à côté de Moscou. René Justrabo, maire de Sidi-Bel-Abbès, du bastion communiste, délégué à l'Assemblée

¹⁷ *Bulletins Politiques de Quinzaine*, Année 1948, Période du 1^{er} au 15 septembre, Archives d'Outre-Mer (AOM), Aix-en-Provence, GGA 11H56.

algérienne a déclaré, le 22 octobre 1948, qu'en cas de conflit, « la logique et la raison appelleraient les Algériens à engager la lutte aux côtés du peuple Russe. »¹⁸ Et, le 8 avril 1949, le secrétaire général du PCA, Paul Caballero, en définissant la politique du parti face à la guerre froide, il a conclu : « Devant l'éventualité d'une guerre contre l'URSS, le Parti Communiste a étudié un ensemble de mesures propres à paralyser l'action des agresseurs [c'est-à-dire des impérialistes - PÁF], et dont l'application interviendra dès l'aventure des hostilités. »¹⁹ En fait, indépendamment des problèmes, on pouvait constater un certain rapprochement entre les partis, tandis que la population européenne s'est éloignée de plus en plus explicitement du PCA, puisqu'elle ne savait pas accepter sa position sur l'indépendance de l'Algérie.

La tragédie du parti socialiste venait de ses déchirements politiques : pendant que certains cercles encourageaient la coopération la plus large possible avec les nationalistes musulmans modérés, les socialistes dirigeant l'administration coloniale, avec des infractions mentionnées, fermaient justement les canaux vers les autochtones ce que leurs compagnons plus libéraux voulaient tenir ouverts à tout prix. Le cas de Raoul Borra est très caractéristique. Sous le titre « L'Algérie est-elle réactionnaire? », le député de SFIO de Bône a commenté dans *l'Est-Républicain* du 17 octobre 1948 les résultats des derniers scrutins. Tout en condamnant « le nationalisme..., fils naturel du colonialisme », l'élu socialiste a pensé « qu'il y aurait injustice et sottise à confondre l'UDMA nettement démocratique avec le PPA [le prédécesseur du MTLD indépendantiste radical - PÁF]. L'UDMA a eu ses péchés de jeunesse. Dans la course de vitesse qui l'opposait au PPA, il a parfois versé dans la surenchère » ; mais ce sont là des erreurs de tactique comme en ont commis tous les autres partis. Tout en déplorant ces erreurs, Borra a manifesté sa confiance dans le parti de Ferhat Abbas. Il a pensé que l'UDMA serait aux côtés de la SFIO « pour mener le combat républicain et que l'Algérie, après avoir traversé une crise grave, reprendra sa marche en avant grâce à l'Union des Démocrates ». ²⁰ Un an plus tard, le député de Constantinois a protesté contre le renouvellement des fraudes pendant les cantonales de mars 1949 exécutées par l'administration dirigée par les socialistes :

« Nous avons, nous socialistes, nos responsabilités dans cet affaire. Naegelen nous a dit qu'il avait le mandat de casser les reins au PPA et personne parmi les parlementaires ne l'a mis en garde. Les administrateurs ont appliqué les instructions avec un zèle exorbitant, mais nous pensions qu'après l'écrasement du PPA on en resterait là. Or, à l'occasion des élections cantonales, la même procédure s'est répétée. Il en résulte un écœure-

¹⁸ *Ibid.* Période du 16 au 30 octobre 1948.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* Période du 1^{er} au 15 avril 1949.

²⁰ *Rapport mensuel d'information sur l'activité musulmane dans le département de Constantine, Année 1948, Période d'octobre, AOM, GGA 11H64.*

ment général. La masse musulmane nous considère comme des imposeurs. »²¹

Le parti s'est appliqué à introduire des réformes de moindre importance dans l'administration et l'éducation. Je cite encore une fois les mots de Borra :

« L'effort de scolarisation et d'enseignement professionnel que nous avons entrepris représente sans doute, pour l'avenir, notre meilleure arme. Il serait désirable non seulement du point de vue économique mais davantage encore peut-être du point de vue politique, qu'il puisse être non seulement maintenu, mais accentué. »²²

Mais le parti SFIO a échoué enfin dans plusieurs cas à cause de la résistance opiniâtre de la droite. En conséquence de l'inefficacité totale, pendant ces années la popularité du parti a baissé non seulement dans le deuxième, mais dans le premier collège aussi où les colons ne savaient pas s'identifier avec la politique socialiste de l'introduction des réformes.

La droite n'était pas aussi cohérente que ne le pensent la plupart des historiens, quoique les problèmes internes des forces de la droite se soient ressemblés. Chez le Mouvement républicain populaire (MRP) catholique comme chez le Rassemblement du peuple français (RPF) gaulliste, des moindres crises internes ont éclaté quand la direction de parti métropolitaine a essayé de s'approcher des représentants politiques des musulmans. Même dans le cas du rapprochement le plus prudent, les sections algériennes ont déposé une réclamation et, plusieurs fois, en signe de protestation, elles ont brandi leur démission collective et leur sortie du mouvement. Par exemple, en été 1949, à propos des changements éventuels du système électoral soutenus par la direction de Paris, M. Guillemin, activiste du MRP de Bône, a reproché aux dirigeants métropolitains de son parti leur attitude imprudente, due à une méconnaissance de leur part des réalités algériennes.²³ Puis, l'année suivante, le Comité Directeur du parti ayant, sans doute à la suite de contacts avec Ferhat Abbas, demandé au Comité interfédéral d'Algérie, d'envisager un rapprochement possible avec l'UDMA, ce dernier aurait refusé, déclarant « ne pouvoir se rapprocher d'un parti dont la politique portait atteinte à la souveraineté française ». ²⁴ En 1950, parmi les rangs du RPF, des mécontentes ont régné à cause de l'entrée en masse des musulmans dans le mouvement. Les membres européens ont parlé d'une réorganisation complète. Une fraction de dissidents a demandé le départ de M. Murat, délégué du Centre National, à qui ils ont reproché d'avoir imprudemment grossi le recrutement en milieux musulmans. Le remplacement de Murat par André Achiary, détesté par les autochtones, ayant été envisagé, M. Djadoune, responsable à l'action musulmane et

²¹ G. Pervillé, « La SFIO, Guy Mollet et l'Algérie de 1945 à 1955, » in B. Ménager - Ph. Ratte - J.-L. Thiébault - R. Vandenbussche - Ch.-M. Wallon-Leducq (édité par), *Guy Mollet un camarade en république*. Lille 1987, 454-455.

²² Bulletins Politiques de Quinzaine, *op. cit.* Période du 1^{er} au 15 décembre 1948.

²³ *Ibid.* Période du 15 au 30 juin 1949.

²⁴ *Ibid.* Période du 1^{er} au 15 janvier 1950.

membre du Conseil National pour le département d'Alger, a déclaré que, si cette mesure était prise, il ferait démissionner ses coreligionnaires.²⁵ Donc, les nord-africains et les métropolitains ne se sont pas accordés au jugement des problèmes algériens, mais, en définitive, c'était toujours la position des colons qui a prévalu : les Pieds Noirs ont réussi à l'aide des personnalités parisiennes les protégeant à prévaloir leur volonté.

Un débat d'autre caractère mais non moins important s'est déroulé dans le camp des radicaux. Au début de 1951, dans le parti connu jusqu'ici comme le défenseur le plus décidé des droits des colons, quelques-uns ont proposé la création des rapports de type nouveau avec les nationalistes modérés. D'après leur explication, c'est nécessaire car les deux communautés – entre lesquelles les rapports étaient assez froids – pouvaient ainsi s'approcher de l'une à l'autre, et la présence des Français à long terme serait assurée. Jacques Chevallier, député d'Alger (radical indépendant) et Conseiller Général, a démissionné de l'Assemblée nationale pour se présenter à l'Assemblée algérienne. Dans une série d'articles intitulés « *Faisons le point* » parus du 19 au 26 décembre 1950 dans *L'Echo d'Alger* (directeur : Alain de Sérigny, délégué à l'Assemblée algérienne, Union et RPF), il a fait valoir la nécessité d'entrer en contact avec les Musulmans « non conformistes ». Il faut, écrivait-il,

« substituer à la notice périmée des unions étriquées telles que les concevaient encores ces temps derniers des collectivités plus ou moins sur la défensive, la notion généreuse, élevée, et combien plus constructive d'une véritable union franco-musulmane..., seule susceptible de créer le climat de confiance dans lequel s'épanouiront des élites insoupçonnées ou négligées... Nous avons trop longtemps méconnu... l'aspect moral de nos problèmes algériens... De ce fait, nous ne comprenons plus les pensées... des Musulmans... Nous n'avons pas saisi que cette évolution morale du Musulman exigeait de nous-même une évolution correspondante..., une adaptation parallèle... Une terminologie absurde limite l'éventail politique algérien à deux tendances : l'une dite « colonialiste » ; l'autre « séparatiste »... Sera suspect quiconque déclarera perfectible l'œuvre française dans ce pays, rappellera des engagements imprudemment souscrits..., ou proposera des suggestions différentes de celles admises par un conformisme de bon aloi... Gardons-nous de jugements aussi sommaires... Certes, il y a des colonialistes..., il y a aussi des séparatistes apôtres d'un nationalisme jaloux et exclusif... S'ils étaient de bonne foi, ils auraient conscience de l'utopie de leur doctrine... Ces deux sectarismes ne sont pas toute l'Algérie. Le soi-disant *no man's land* qui les sépare mériterait d'être exploré... C'est là qu'il faut puiser. Nous y découvrirons des hommes certainement différents de ceux auxquels nous avons été accoutumés... Le conformisme qui s'exprime trop souvent dans le premier collège par un conformisme béat et dans le second par „un béni oui ouisme” aveugle... J'entends que, dans le deuxième collège, les alliés des jours difficiles... placent la France

²⁵ *Ibid.* Période du 1^{er} au 15 août 1950.

au-dessus de ces petites. Nous leur en devons reconnaissance. Mais, à côté d'elles, il est des recrues occasionnelles qu'inspire la seule pensée de leur intérêt, et dont l'âpreté défigure le vrai visage de la France... Dans le choix des hommes politiques, considérons qu'il est plus sûr d'avoir auprès de soi des demi-rebelles que des domestiques. »²⁶

Il faut souligner que cette tendance se nommant « libérale » n'a pas voulu donner des droits plus étendus aux autochtones, elle voulait seulement assurer « l'éternité » de la présence française *avec d'autres moyens* que les purs et durs qui n'étaient pas encore disposés à négocier avec les nationalistes, et, comme réponse, ils ont qualifié tout de suite les libéraux des « séparatistes ». Dans une lettre à Alain de Sérigny, les députés Aumeran, Fernand Chevalier, Rencurel et Viard et les sénateurs Borgeaud et Rogier se sont déclarés « opposés à la transformation de l'Assemblée algérienne en Parlement, ...à l'idée folle d'une République algérienne, et à un fédéralisme quelconque, ...résolus à maintenir les deux collèges, à refuser de collaborer avec ceux qui injurient la France et font étalage de séparatisme, comme le font les communistes, le MTLD et l'UDMA ». ²⁷ Entre les deux groupes un débat très dur s'est formé, ils se sont présentés sur des listes séparées aux élections de 1951 (liste Chevallier, liste Rencurel). L'opinion publique des colons était partagée entre les deux conceptions, et comme les deux tendances avaient des leaders influents, le résultat est devenu « nul » aux élections. En somme, la victoire de la droite colonialiste et attachée à l'Algérie française n'était pas en cause.

*Les députés du premier collège dans l'Assemblée nationale (1951)*²⁸

Partis	Alger	Oran	Constantine
PCA	Pierre Fayet	Alice Sportisse	-
SFIO	-	Maurice Rabier	-
RGR	-	-	René Mayer, Paul Pantaloni, Jules Valle
MRP	-	-	-
Union algérienne	Adolphe Aumeran	François Quilici	-
RPF et indépendants	Georges Blachette, Colonna d'Istria, Marcel Ribère, Marcel Paternot	Fouques Duparc	Haumesser
UNIR	-	Roger de Saivre	-

²⁶ *Ibid.* Période du 15 au 31 janvier 1951.

²⁷ *Le Journal d'Alger*, le 24 janvier 1951.

²⁸ *Ibid.* le 19 juin 1951.

La disparition des querelles parmi les sections algériennes des partis français

Les crises coloniales plus en plus étendues au début des années 1950 (la guerre « sale » en Indochine, les problèmes politiques très graves en Tunisie et au Maroc) ont provoqué des réactions défensives de la part de la société des colons algériens, les discordes internes antérieures se sont pratiquement tuées. Cependant, l'extrême-gauche a continué sa politique d'indépendance.

Après les élections législatives de 1951, l'initiative du PCA visant un front national commun avec les nationalistes est arrivée enfin à bon port.²⁹ Pourquoi ? Parce que, aux élections, les fraudes électorales des années précédentes se sont répétées, ce qui a empêché l'entrée des nationalistes à l'Assemblée nationale, à Paris. Il est devenu évident que les partis nationalistes ne pouvaient pas défendre leurs intérêts à la manière ancienne, c'est pourquoi les partis ont tenté de forcer l'adoption des réformes. Dans la formation du front, le parti communiste a joué un rôle décisif, mais la coopération n'a pas duré. D'une part, le PCA ne savait point lever les scrupules anciens des nationalistes radicaux, d'autre part, la direction du MTLD n'était pas disposée à couper la poire en deux et elle a essayé d'accaparer la conduite du mouvement national. Au milieu de 1952, le front s'est disloqué. En même temps, la base européenne a quitté massivement le PCA : aux élections municipales du département d'Alger de janvier 1952, le PC a écrasé qui, par rapport aux élections du 17 juin 1951, a perdu 47 % de ses voix dans l'ensemble du département d'Alger et 50 % dans la seule ville d'Alger ! D'après l'auteur d'un rapport préparé au gouverneur général :

« Il faut y voir une réaction de l'élément européen contre la propagande du PCA pour l'indépendance de l'Algérie et contre l'attitude de ce parti dans les événements de Tunisie. La crainte que les troubles ne s'étendent à l'Algérie a incité à abandonner le PCA tous ceux qui lui apportaient leurs voix non par conviction, mais par simple désir de davantage de justice sociale. »³⁰

Les crises coloniales ont provoqué des réactions divergentes dans les partis de droite. Dans le MRP, les intellectuels catholiques (François Mauriac, André Mandouze) ont attaqué de plus en plus décisivemement la politique de force du gouvernement au Maroc, en Tunisie et en Indochine, et, en faisant appel aux principes chrétiens, ils ont exigé une attitude plus libérale. C'est pourquoi des colons algériens ont lancé des attaques impitoyables contre ces intellectuels. François Mauriac a reproduit dans ses *Bloc-Notes* quelques lettres qu'il recevait des colons nord-africains. Un Français résidant à Casablanca lui avait écrit :

« Il faut tout de même que tu saches que si tu continues à écrire des conneries, il va t'arriver un de ces jours un accident, ce ne sera plus écrit. Tu es un sale individu, traître au maréchal Pétain [très populaire parmi les colons - PÁF] (...) Prends bien garde car tu vas recevoir une des raclées mai-

²⁹ Sivan, *Communisme et nationalisme en Algérie 1920-1962*, 185.

³⁰ *Bulletin mensuel d'Information*, janvier 1952, Préfecture d'Alger, AOM, GGA 11H63.

son (...). J'ai des poings en excellent état, ceux d'un agriculteur qui te vomit à la gueule tout son mépris, sale lâche, salaud, on n'a que l'injure à la bouche pour te parler et tu te dis catholique, chrétien, crotte ! »³¹

Parallèlement, la droite modérée traditionnelle et l'extrême-droite presque détruite après la guerre mondiale ont repris des forces. En conséquence du déplacement vers la droite par suite des crises de gouvernement en France, ces forces ont reçu le rôle gouvernemental. Avec elles, la tendance intransigeante, défenseur à tout prix des intérêts coloniaux a gagné de la place qui n'était pas disposée au compromis³² bien qu'il ait été évident que la France n'était pas capable de refouler les mouvements nationaux plus en plus forts dans ses colonies. En même temps, il faut noter que l'anticommunisme de cette droite était très vif pendant toute l'époque, mais lutter contre les « cocos » signifiait autre chose qu'à la métropole. En France, c'était une partie intégrante de la guerre froide et d'un débat idéologique et social, tandis qu'en Algérie l'anticommunisme voulait dire aussi une action contre « le séparatisme », « l'abandon de l'Algérie française », car le PCA qui a été accusé d'action « anti-France », a poursuivi une politique d'indépendance.

Après que l'armée française a subi une grave défaite en Indochine au printemps de 1954, ce type de politique intransigeante a échoué. Le représentant de la gauche des radicaux, Pierre Mendès-France pouvait former le gouvernement (avec le soutien des communistes) qui, à Genève, a établi un armistice avec les Vietnamiens, puis en marchant sur la route des réformes il a donné une autonomie interne à la Tunisie. La population française de l'Algérie a accueilli avec des sentiments mitigés ces avancées politiques nécessaires. Bien qu'il ait été reconnu qu'il fallait trouver une issue de la guerre « sale », elle n'a pas pu accepter que le gouvernement ait introduit de telles réformes audacieuses en Afrique du Nord. Comme un rapporteur du Gouvernement général l'observe :

« La majorité des Européens a suivi avec intérêt les efforts du gouvernement Mendès-France pour mettre fin à l'hémorragie indochinoise ; la fin de ce pénible cauchemar a été accueillie avec satisfaction, certains cependant pensent avec quelque inquiétude, aux réactions que cela pourra provoquer dans les milieux nationalistes nord-africains. L'intervention spectaculaire du Président du Conseil pour essayer de débrider l'abcès tunisien est en général moins bien accueillie. Ce n'est du reste pas tant le principe de l'octroi de l'autonomie interne que l'on critique que la politique de collaboration avec Bourguiba et le Néo-Destour [chef et parti des indépendantistes

³¹ Chebel d'Appollonia, *Histoire politique des intellectuels en France 1944-1954*. Tome II. *Le Temps de l'engagement*, 240.

³² J.-P. Rioux, « Des clandestins aux activistes (1945-1965), » in M. Winock (sous la direction de), *Histoire de l'extrême-droite en France*. Paris 1993, 215-222.

tunisiens - PÁF] et l'application trop brutale et avec des garanties que l'on juge insuffisantes sans les connaître, de cette autonomie. »³³

Cette population avait peur que cette politique appelée également « laxiste » entraîne une action plus forte des nationalistes. Toutefois, en Algérie, le gouvernement est resté stable : en octobre, le ministre de l'Intérieur, François Mitterrand a déclaré que la présence française dans le pays d'Afrique du Nord serait « maintenue ». ³⁴

Conclusion

Ma conclusion est que pendant l'époque examinée, les partis et les mouvements européens ne se sont pas apparus dans l'arène politique comme une seule « masse » homogène, mais sur certaines questions (la Constitution, la loi organique du statut de l'Algérie, le rapport aux réformes, les relations avec les nationalistes musulmans), des points de vue différents ont été élaborés.

³³ Rapport mensuel d'information... *Ibid.* Période de juin-juillet 1954, AOM, GGA 11H65.

³⁴ A. Taleb Bendiab, « Le 1^{er} novembre 1954 en Algérie », in *Mediterrán Tanulmányok/Études Méditerranéennes*, Vol 4. Szeged 1990, 5.

*The British Foreign Office on the Situation of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, 1951–53**

PÉTER VUKMAN



On 28 November 1951, Ivo Mallet, British ambassador to Belgrade (1951–1954),¹ sent a telegram to the Foreign Office about an article published in *Borba*, the official daily paper of the Yugoslavian Communist Party (YCP). The article was the written version of the interview of the YCP Party Secretary, Josip Broz Tito with Drew Pearson, an American journalist. The Yugoslav Party Secretary answered one of the questions the following way: "Finally, I am in a position to tell you that, with or without Vatican consent, we shall settle the question of Stepinac,² within the next month at the latest, though it is obvious that he can no longer perform the functions of a high dignitary of the church inside our country."³ That was the first time that Tito directly indicated the release of the Croatian archbishop, who had been in prison since autumn 1946. Indeed, the archbishop was released on December 5, 1951.⁴ The event seemed to indicate that the regime started a more liberal religious policy as opposed to the complete subjugation of the Christian faith and the Christian churches, which had characterized the line of

* The research for this paper was written was in part supported by the Hungarian Scholarship Board Office Hungarian State Eötvös Scholarship and is based on archival research that took place in the National Archives – Public Records Office, Kew Gardens, London between August–October 2007.

¹ Sir William Ivo Mallet, British ambassador to Yugoslavia between 1951 and 1954, and to Spain between 1954 and 1960.

² Alojzije Stepinac (1898–1960), archbishop of Zagreb, cardinal. He was appointed archbishop in 1937. During World War II he pursued a controversial policy. Even if he did not condemn openly the *ustaše* regime, he criticized the mass conversion of the Serbs to the Catholic faith. For the above-mentioned controversial role, he was sentenced to 16 years of imprisonment in a show trial in 1946. He was released in 1951 to house arrest at his native village. His beatification in 1998 divided public opinion again.

³ Foreign Office Papers, Political Files, The National Archives – Public Records Office, London, (henceforth: PRO FO) 371/95572 RY 1781/79.

⁴ The archbishop was transferred to his native village, Krašnić, where he was put in charge of the local parish.

the official policy so far and was carried out in various ways.⁵ Still, only a little bit later than a year, on December 17, 1952, Yugoslavia denounced the diplomatic relations with the Vatican and re-started its anticlerical campaign with even more intensity.

The aim of this article is to analyze the motives behind the above mentioned two steps of the Yugoslav government as it was seen by the British diplomatic corps in Belgrade in order to offer a clear picture on the situation of the Catholic Church, and therefore the Catholic faith in a country at the time when the primary interest of the Yugoslav communist leadership was to consolidate Western diplomatic relations after the escalation of the Soviet-Yugoslav conflict, which broke out in 1948.⁶

The detention of Archbishop Stepinac seriously worried the Yugoslav leadership because his captivity greatly complicated their relationship with the Vatican. Moreover, they had no interest in making a martyr of him. This can be indicated from the references the Yugoslav leaders made on his possible release, conditional upon his immediate leaving of the country. The Yugoslav deputy foreign minister, Aleš Bebler, also made this clear during his conversation with the papal legate, Monsignor Oddi on 2 June 1951, and the official Yugoslav news agency (Tanjug) communicated it on 5 July 1951.⁷ Another possible explanation for the archbishop's release can be found in the main aim of the Yugoslav government, namely to create a Croatian national church, similarly to the Serbian Orthodox Church, which they considered easier to oversee and control, it being detached from the Vatican.⁸ In this bargaining, it was Stepinac himself who was the most important card in the hands of the Yugoslav leaders.

The change in the Yugoslav opinion is interesting because even as late as the autumn of 1950, Tito, fearing the possible negative reaction of the Orthodox Serbs, who were disturbed by Stepinac's deeds during World War II, refused the

⁵ The methods the Yugoslav Communist used against the churches varied systematically, from propaganda war through the imprisonment of the priesthood, attacks against church personnel and property to the suppression of religious education.

⁶ For the relations between the Communist state and the different religions see: S. Alexander, *Church and State in Yugoslavia since 1945*. Cambridge-New York 1974, for the position of the Catholic church in Croatia and the relations between Yugoslavia and the Vatican see: M. Akmadža, "The Position of the Catholic Church in Croatia 1945-1970," *Review of Croatian History* 2:1 (2006), 89-115.

⁷ TNA PRO FO 371/95571 RY1781/56 and PRO FO 371/95571 RY 1781/58. In his telegram on 30 June, Peake mentioned that Tito had been ready to do that as early as in 1946. Moreover, Vladimir Bakarić, Prime Minister and Party Secretary of Croatia, visited Stepinac in the Lepoglava prison in May 1947 and offered an amnesty to him if he left the country immediately. M. Akmadža-A. Vlašić, "Vladimir Bakarić's Stance towards the Catholic Church in Croatia 1945-1953," *Review of Croatian History* 3:1 (2008), 167.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 164-168.

release of the Croatian archbishop.⁹ On the other hand, as the under-secretary of the Holy See, Cardinal Tardini,¹⁰ set it forth to the British legate to the Holy See, Somers-Cocks on 15 February 1951, the most important aim of the Vatican was to guarantee free church services and teaching in religious spirit. Everything else, including the fortune of Stepinac, was of minor importance for them: "What the Catholic Church required was the right to carry out its apostolate, i. e. the right to preach and teach freely. Everything else was incidental, not only Church property but even Archbishop Stepinac."¹¹ Still, at least in public, the Vatican authorities emphasized that no change had occurred in their condemnation of the archbishop's trial. Moreover, they expressed that the Holy See respected and accepted Stepinac's opinion of being fully aware of his innocence: "Views of the Holy See regarding the trial and condemnation of Archbishop Stepinac are well known. It is obvious therefore that the Holy See would welcome the liberation of the Archbishop. [The] Holy See learns, however, that Archbishop Stepinac, being convinced of his innocence, prefers to remain near his flock. [The] Holy See cannot but respect these sentiments and consequently does not intend to impose a separation which would be opposed to Mgr. Stepinac's conception of his duty."¹² Therefore, another factor in Yugoslav foreign policy must have played a crucial role in the archbishop's final release. Namely, in autumn 1950, a bill on the aid to Yugoslav economy came on the agenda of the Foreign Policy Committee of the Congress of the United States.¹³ The Yugoslavs feared that the bill, which aimed to help the disastrous Yugoslav economy, might be opposed by some religious members of the committee¹⁴ who demanded the immediate release of the archbishop in exchange for supporting the bill. As for the British ambassador to Belgrade, Ivo Mallet traced it back to the above-mentioned proviso in his letter to the Foreign Office on 30 November 1951, written at the time when the archbishop was still in prison. In this letter, Mallet expressed his opinion that, on the one hand, Tito might have had enough of the continuous harassment of those mem-

⁹ On the other hand, in his telegram on 27 November 1950, Peake thought that Tito's opinion rather changed because he did not want to admit that he made political concessions for the American economic aid. PRO FO 371/88352 RY 1783/29.

¹⁰ Domenico Tardini (1888–1961) cardinal and politician. Pro-Secretary of State, for Extraordinary and Ordinary affairs from 1952, Cardinal Secretary of State from 1958 to 1961.

¹¹ PRO FO 371/95571 RY 1781/33.

¹² The extract was the official answer of the Holy See to the note of the Yugoslav Ministry of Foreign Affairs and was made public in the 9–10 November 1950 issue of *L'Osservatore Romano*. PRO FO 371/95572 RY 1781/62.

¹³ The foreign economic aid was seriously needed in Yugoslavia because critical food shortage emerged as a result of the forced industrial policy of the regime and the drought.

¹⁴ Among them Brien McMahon (1903–1952), Democrat member of the United States Senate from Connecticut between 1945 to 1952, the only Catholic member of the Senate that time. He met Tito in July 1951. For this see: PRO FO 371/95572 RY 1781/68. McMahon is famous for the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission, through his authorship of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (the McMahon Act).

bers of the Congress, who had visited him that year, on the other hand, the Yugoslav leader wanted to avoid the impression that he was forced to bow before a possible American political pressure.¹⁵

Apart from the archbishop's fate, the British Foreign Office was equally interested in the situation of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia in general. Therefore, on 1 March 1952, Ivo Mallet prepared a long report dealing with the situation of the Catholic Church and the Catholic faith under Tito's regime. While the ambassador observed and pointed out certain liberal tendencies in the economic and political life of the country, it did not escape his attention that, in case of religion, exactly the opposite was true. Therefore, he prepared a brief summary on the main events preceding and leading to the rather tense relationship between the Yugoslav state and the Catholic church in the country. Beginning in 1945, as Mallet emphasized, anticlerical propaganda was first mainly carried out in Slovenia. Moreover, the Communist regime was not against religious education at that time, neither intervened in the training of Catholic priests or the managing of church property. According to him, the *modus vivendi* was maintained even in 1950, although this might also be influenced by the opinion of the American public and its impact in the aid policy towards Yugoslavia. In Mallet's interpretation, the situation of the Catholic church worsened drastically in 1951, partly because the Yugoslav authorities initiated a trial against the Catholic seminar in Zagreb with the accusation of conspiracy against the state. The political impact of the trial was rendered more serious by other incidents. For example, the bishop of Maribor was criticized in the local press on such unfounded charges that the pilgrims cut out the red star from the Yugoslav flag during the procession at Ptuj on 31 August that year. As a result, the bishop of Ljubljana was brutally beaten and the authorities turned the trial of the perpetrators into an anti-clerical mockery. In the ambassador's opinion, the incident clearly reflected the indifference of the authorities towards such insults. According to Mallet, the Catholic church was attacked on three fronts: children's education, priests' training and fund raising, the last of which had been sanctioned only in Bosnia Herzegovina so far.¹⁶ The ambassador also pointed out that although it was still possible to receive religious instruction in primary schools, it was only permitted through the Society of Cyril and Method in Slovenia. In Croatia, where such priest organizations did not exist that time, certain priests, loyal to the government, were authorized for such instruction, in about 20 per cent of the Croatian schools. Later, the Slovenian government, in a decree issued on 1 February, forbade religious instruction in schools altogether, which was followed by similar steps in Croatia and Bosnia Herzegovina. Those pupils who, infringing the prohibition, still learned religious instruction were failed at the exams at the end of the school year. Similar meth-

¹⁵ PRO FO 371/95572 RY 1781/82.

¹⁶ The restrictions were easier to be carried out in Bosnia Herzegovina because of the ethnically mixed population, compared to the Catholic Slovenia or the dominantly Catholic Croatia where, except the Orthodox Serbs, the population was Roman Catholic.

ods were used in trying to make the priests' training impossible. For example, the theological institutes in Ljubljana and Zagreb were shut by the authorities,¹⁷ who also tried to force the local priests into state organizations, similar to the trade unions.¹⁸

Therefore, according to Mallet, real changes took place during the autumn of 1951, exactly when Stepinac's release was again put on the government agenda. In his opinion, one of the first signs of these changes was that the attacks against the Slovenian priests became more frequent. One of them was shot in October and others were so seriously beaten that they had to be taken to hospital. Moreover, the attacks against the ordinary priesthood were not limited to Slovenia but spread over to Croatia and the Dalmatian coast, where, until recently, the Catholic church had enjoyed a "relative calm." The British ambassador also mentioned in his analysis that the propaganda attack against the Catholic church intensified in the Yugoslav press, too. For example, the leading Croatian daily, *Vjestnik*, accused the Vatican that it had supported the Croatian *ustaša* movement during World War II. According to the British ambassador, all of these measures indicated that the regime shifted the focus of accusations from the Catholic clergy to the Catholic faith itself.¹⁹ However, Mallet could only name a few possible reasons for this change of attitude. The decision could be influenced by the fact that the Yugoslav leadership identified the Catholic church with the Vatican's policy but he rejected this possibility. Instead, he tried to localize the reasons somewhere else and realized that the anti-religious campaign made it more difficult for the Yugoslavs to approach the Western powers. Therefore, he suggested that some internal development be the main reason for this political shift, namely, tensions among the members of the Yugoslav Communist leadership. As the Vatican's reaction to the Yugoslav gesture of releasing Stepinac was rather cold, the moderate members of the party leadership might have thought that the Yugoslavs' concession was rather useless. Moreover, as far as Mallet understood, it became more and more difficult for Tito and the other members of the Yugoslav leadership to keep the left wing of the party, which accused the leaders of smearing the Marxist

¹⁷ Before the closing down of the theology seminars, the buildings of the denominational schools were confiscated based on a law passed in 1945 prohibiting the maintenance of private education. The law also stated that the responsible ministry had jurisdiction over the authorization of theology education. This later was banned in 1947, although the boys' seminar in Zagreb was allowed to function until 1948. Akmadža-Vlašić, "Vladimir Bakarić's Stance," 168.

¹⁸ For example, the Cyril and Method Society in Slovenia, which gathered 39 per cent of the Slovenian priesthood. The similar organisation in Bosnia Herzegovina, for the above-mentioned reason, gathered 80 per cent of the Catholic priests in the republic. According to Mallet, a similar organization was planned in Croatia, too. PRO FO 371/102668 WY 1783/2. In Croatia, the process started in 1947, first among the priests on the Istrian Peninsula. Akmadža-Vlašić, "Vladimir Bakarić's Stance," 167.

¹⁹ In his speech in the Politburo of the Croatian Communist Party on 24 August 1946, Vladimir Bakarić stated just the opposite of it: „One should attack the priests, not religion." *Ibid.*, 162.

ideology while advancing towards the West, silent. Still, for Mallet, another possible reason could be rooted in Communist ideology itself because atheism made it impossible not to attack religion.²⁰

One may ask how the British public reacted to this facet of Yugoslav policy. It can be stated that the British public opinion showed great concern about the fate of Stepinac, and about the situation of religion in Yugoslavia in general. Private letters, copies of inquiring letters sent to the Members of Parliaments from their voters, proposals and memoranda of various Yugoslav organizations in exile reached the Foreign Office, sometimes on a daily basis and especially at the end of 1952 and early 1953, as Tito's visit to Great Britain drew closer. Still, the Foreign Office always formulated a non-committal reply as the answer of the Parliamentary Secretary of State, Ernest Davies to a Member of Parliament on 1 January 1951 clearly illustrates: "His Majesty's Government have never sought to condone religious intolerance in any part of the world and are in favor of complete freedom of religion. For your personal information His Majesty's Ambassador in Yugoslavia will continue to take any opportunity that may present itself to keep before the Yugoslav Government the fact that public opinion in this country is concerned with the instances to the contrary, such as the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac."²¹ But they did not wish to interfere in Yugoslav internal affairs.

One may also ask whether such attacks were restricted to the Catholic church or a similar process characterized the relationship between the Yugoslav state and other religions. In Mallet's above mentioned analysis, the British ambassador dealt with the situation of the Orthodox church, the other large Christian faith in Yugoslavia and reported on similar unfavorable tendencies. The press carried out a propaganda campaign not only against the Catholics but also against the Orthodox believers; many Orthodox churches were looted during the previous years. Moreover, the leaders of the Orthodox theological faculty in Belgrade were informed in a threatening letter about their "being liquidated by 28 June."²²

The British ambassador to Belgrade prepared a more detailed analysis of the situation of the Orthodox church on 3 July 1952 in which he dealt with the annual meeting of the Council of Serbian Orthodox Bishops in particular and the Serbian Orthodox Church in general. In this report, the British ambassador emphasized that the Serbian church, as a result of its organization and history, was more vulnerable than the Catholics, who had a superior foreign authority (namely the Vatican) above their national organizational structure. As the Serbian Orthodox Church was a national church in the real meaning of the world, it lacked that kind of protection, even if it was a member of the Orthodox World Council. Therefore, it was more exposed to the secular authorities. Moreover, its religious

²⁰ PRO FO 371/102668 WY 1783/2.

²¹ PRO FO 371/88352 RY1783/56.

²² PRO FO 371/102268 WY 1783/2.

teaching practice was made nearly impossible after the World War,²³ which could be impossible in case of the Catholics or the Muslims. The Communist authorities had aimed to form a direct control over the Orthodox church since their coming into power. As at first attempt, they formed the Alliance of Orthodox Priests, which, even if under duress, 80 per cent of the priesthood had joined. The fact that only a few people were willing to join the priesthood resulted to an acute problem, which was further intensified by the fact that only two priest seminars existed, one at Rakovica, in the neighborhood of Belgrade, the other at Prizren, in today southern Kosovo, housing and training about 3 hundred students when at least a thousand were necessary.²⁴ Hundreds of churches were abandoned because the Church lacked the financial resources for their maintenance.²⁵

Another form of submission of the Orthodox Church to state power was the election of a new patriarch loyal to the state, Vikentije II, after the death of Gavriilo²⁶ on 3 May 1950²⁷ as it was reported by the then British ambassador to Belgrade, Sir Charles Peake.²⁸ Peake considered Vikentije a puppet because the new patriarch lacked a wide-span church career which would have qualified him for the new title on its own. Moreover, Josip, the metropolitan of Skoplje, head of the Holy Synod,²⁹ was arrested on 24 June, shortly before the election of the new patriarch took place.

Although the grievances they suffered were similar, it would be premature to suppose a real rapprochement between the two Christian churches. Mallet came to a similar conclusion, too, and mentioned in his letter on 13 November 1952 that it would be impossible to leave 900 years of suspicion and distrust behind, espe-

²³ During World War II, Serbian priesthood suffered serious losses. About a quarter or a fifth of its clergy died and six of its bishops were executed, three of them by the ustaše. Nearly half of the churches and monasteries were demolished in the fights. S. P. Ramet, *Balkan Babel. Politics, Culture, and Religion in Yugoslavia*. Boulder 1992, 145–146, 150–151.

²⁴ PRO FO 371/95573 RY 1782/1.

²⁵ PRO FO 371/102268 WY 1783/3.

²⁶ Gavriilo Dožić (1881–1950), Serbian Orthodox Patriarch between 1938 and 1950. He was interned in the Dachau concentration camp because he had condemned Yugoslavia's signing of the Tripartite Act with Nazi Germany. He was freed in the summer of 1945 and returned to Yugoslavia in 1946.

²⁷ Vikentije Prodanov (1890–1958), bishop of Zletovo and Strumica, Orthodox Patriarch from 1950.

²⁸ Sir Charles Brinsley Prembleton Peake (1897–1958), British ambassador to Yugoslavia between 1946 and 1951, then British ambassador to Greece.

²⁹ During the inaugural ceremony, the new patriarch received the veneration of the other prelates while sitting on the throne. Then, contrary to traditions, he stood up and shook hands with the state and party dignitaries present at the ceremony. Peake took it as a symbol of loyalty to the Communist leadership. PRO FO 371/88351 RY 1783/9. It is an interesting parallel that Josip was released from the Trstenik monastery where he was under house arrest on 29 November 1951, a few days earlier than Stepinac was transferred to his native village, probably in an effort to soothe the expected Serb opposition to the release of the Croatian archbishop. PRO FO 371/95572 RY 1781/82.

cially because only 7 years had passed since World War II when these grievances manifested themselves in violent outleashes. The British ambassador reminded the Foreign Office that the Croatian Catholic church was still generally associated with Pavelić's Croatian *ustase*, just as the politics of the Vatican with Italian irredentism towards Yugoslavia.³⁰

That is to say, the question of Trieste escalated again between Yugoslavia and Italy in 1952 and to make things more complicated, the Italian prime minister, Alcide de Gasperi³¹ adopted a more severe attitude as the parliamentary elections came closer. At the same time, as a result of the intensified Yugoslav-Turkish and Yugoslav-Greek rapprochement,³² Tito lost his interest in good neighbourly relations with Italy. Under these circumstances, it was highly unfortunate that the official view of the Holy See, probably because of the Yugoslav attacks against the Catholic faith, stiffened. Moreover, the Pope promoted Stepinac to cardinal the same year, which was considered as an interference with the internal affairs of Yugoslavia by the authorities.³³ The papal legate, Tardini changed his view, too, as it can be deduced from the dispatch of the British legate to the Holy See to the Foreign Office on 5 December 1952. According to the dispatch, Tardini made it clear that the position of the Vatican on Stepinac's case had remained firm and the only reason for its modification would be a general settlement between the Vatican and Yugoslavia: "Nevertheless, if it should be possible to reach a *modus vivendi* with the Yugoslav Government [...] Monsignor Tardini did not suppose that it would be impossible to solve the particular problem of Monsignor Stepinac."³⁴ However, the British legate did not consider it feasible, especially because that "indeed might well compromise the whole position of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, as it has already been compromised in varying degrees in some other Communist controlled countries."³⁵ The conflict of different interests resulted in Yugoslavia's denunciation of diplomatic relations with the Holy See on 17 December 1952 and it was restored only in 1970.

The reasons leading to the denunciation were most aptly enumerated in the speech of the Yugoslav Minister of Foreign Affairs, Edvard Kardelj³⁶ in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Yugoslav federal parliament, the Škupsčina, on 18

³⁰ PRO FO 371/102268 WY 1783/8.

³¹ Alcide de Gasperi (1881–1954), Italian statesman and politician, founder of the Italian Christian Democratic Party. From 1945 to 1953 he was the prime minister of Italy. Before his death, he was the president of the European Parliament.

³² The result of this rapprochement was a short lived military treaty, the so called Balkan Pact, which was signed in Ankara, Turkey, on 9 August 1954.

³³ Akmadža and Vlašić considers the establishment of priest organizations as the real cause of the Vatican's interference with the internal affairs of Yugoslavia. Akmadža-Vlašić, "Vladimir Bakarić's Stance," 170. Mallet considered Stepinac's appointment as a good pretext. PRO FO 371/102266 WY 1781/30.

³⁴ PRO FO 371/102266 WY 1781/21.

³⁵ PRO FO 371/102266 WY 1781/21.

³⁶ Edvard Kardelj (1910–1979), Slovenian born Communist politician, one of the main theoretician of self-management, minister of foreign affairs between 1948 and 1953.

December. His speech also gives a clear picture of his government's opinion concerning religion in general. In his speech, Kardelj expressed his conviction that the foreign press campaign on the situation of the churches in Yugoslavia was intensified because of Tito's upcoming visit to Great Britain in the following March.³⁷ Moreover, Kardelj regarded religion as a social phenomenon, which was impossible to exterminate by persecution but that was otherwise uncharacteristic of the Yugoslav state. Kardelj again stated that "[a] *modus vivendi* with the Roman Catholic Church [wa]s still [...] quite possible. The main condition [wa]s that the Church should limit itself to religion. Individual priests need not be excluded from political activity, but only within the framework of the existing social forms. The Yugoslav Government does not demand that the Churches or individual priests should make propaganda for Communism, less socialism. It does not demand that they should detach themselves from the Vatican but they must take a patriotic attitude" and he concluded his speech with a famous proverb: "and render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's."³⁸

Still, the circumstances gradually improved. A law on the legal situation of the Catholic Church was passed on 27 April 1953 and less retaliation against Christian believers took place. Real improvement started after Stepinac's death in 1960, which resulted in the signing of a protocol between the two parties in 1966. Finally, diplomatic relations were restored in 1970 and Tito visited the Vatican in 1971.³⁹

The aim of this article was to analyze how the British Foreign Office saw the situation of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia in general and the case of Archbishop Stepinac in particular in the early 1950s. As it can be seen in the article, the Yugoslav Communist regime pursued its policy against the Catholic Church through various methods and with varied intensity. The already complex relationship between the Yugoslav government and the Catholic hierarchy was further complicated among other things by the personal fate of Archbishop Stepinac, of whom the Yugoslavs refused to make a martyr; the bad economic situation of the country, which made Western economic help inevitable; the left wing of the Communist party, which opposed further rapprochement with the West; and such factors in foreign policy as the Italian general elections in 1952 or the Yugoslav-Greek and the Yugoslav-Turkish rapprochement; not to mention the change in the attitude of the official Vatican policy in Stepinac's case. All of these factors

³⁷ Tito's visit to Great Britain took place in March 1953, a few days after Stalin died. It was a return visit for Anthony Eden's visit to Yugoslavia the previous autumn. Religious demonstrations indeed took place during Tito's stay in England. For a detailed analysis of the visit and the British religious reaction to it see: K. Spehnjak, "Josip Broz Tito's Visit to Great Britain in 1953," *Review of Croatian History* 1:1 (2005), 273–293.

³⁸ PRO FO 371/ 102266 WY 1781/32.

³⁹ Ramet, *Balkan Babel*, 132–133. For the relations between the Yugoslav state and the Catholic Church after 1953 see: M. Akmadža, "Pregovori Svete stolice i Jugoslavije i potpirivanje protokola iz 1966. godine," [Negotiations between the Vatican and Yugoslavia and the signing of the 1966 protocol] *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 36:2 (2004), 473–503.

resulted in the denunciation of diplomatic relations on 17 December 1952. It can also be deduced from the British reports, that contrary to the similar grievances, no real rapprochement took place between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox churches, at least during the time frame of the analysis. It is also inferred from the British Foreign Office papers that the official British foreign policy did not want to intervene in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, although the British public opinion was impressed by the religious grievances.

Three definite conclusions on indefinable serfdom*

MARTEN SEPPEL



For a long time, there have been serious discussions about the terms of the status of the peasantry in different regions of medieval and early modern Europe. Above all the German term "Leibeigenschaft" has fueled the passions and brought a great number of antagonistic interpretations. But the words in other languages for serfdom carry the same fluctuating meaning which has allowed historians to adapt this historical term according to their needs and argumentation.¹ On the other hand, one cannot ignore Reinhart Koselleck's demand that first making clear what the historical terms mean is the minimum requirement in order to speak at all about history and especially social history.²

Regardless of numerous attempts to formulate what kind of status of dependence serfdom was, a universal definition has not been found. It seems impossible to come to an agreement about the character of serfdom in its pure form. Usually the defect of such definitions attempted so far is that they describe serf relations only very generally or on the contrary so that they are applicable only to one or some concrete regions during some time-period. But the first criterion of every definition should be its possible universality which would allow us to make a clear difference between serf and other relations of dependence, or help to decide where to draw a line to mark the beginning of serfdom in the development of landlord-peasant relations. A usual component of the definitions of serfdom is al-

* This paper was completed while I was a visiting scholar at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, UCL, with financial support from the Estonian Science Foundation.

¹ Cf. R. Rosdolsky, "On the nature of peasant serfdom in Central and Eastern Europe," *Journal of Central European Affairs* 12 (1952), 128-139; J. Kusber, "Leibeigenschaft im Rußland der Frühen Neuzeit. Aspekte der rechtlichen Lage und der sozialen Praxis," in *Leibeigenschaft. Bäuerliche Unfreiheit in der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. J. Klußmann, Köln-Weimar-Wien 2003, 141-142.

² R. Koselleck, "Sozialgeschichte und Begriffsgeschichte," in *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven im internationalen Zusammenhang*. Bd. I: *Die Sozialgeschichte innerhalb der Geschichtswissenschaft*, ed. W. Schieder, V. Sellin. Göttingen 1986, 89-109.

so pointing out its differences from slavery but with that very often many historical cases of "serfdom" get excluded at the same time.

The definitions in the encyclopedias are in the same way inconsistent. Perhaps the best article of encyclopedia on serfdom so far has been written by Friedrich-Wilhelm Henning in the *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (1978). Henning does not give a direct definition of serfdom, instead, he describes how serfdom has been most often looked at in the sources and the historiography. He states already in the first sentence: "The term serfdom is not used (nor has been used) in an unambiguous meaning." Its meaning has been wide both in the sources and in the literature. There has been no clear perception about serfdom in the past nor is there nowadays.³

In fact, the inevitable diffuse of the term "serfdom" has been pointed out in the historiography already for more than a hundred years.⁴ The reasons why the numerous attempts to offer a universal definition to serfdom have failed so far are obvious. The term "serfdom" or its equivalents in other languages is a historical social-legal term and not a technical word. It has had many inconsistent meanings already from its emergence in the medieval sources.⁵ Serfdom has been known in so many countries all over Europe during over thousand years. The German term "Leibeigenschaft" alone was used nearly for five hundred years both in medieval West-German territories and in early modern East-German territories. Using one and the same term for so many regions during such a long time makes it unrealistic to give a single description to this historical concept. Besides even in one region serfdom was never a uniform and invariable institution.⁶

Therefore, it is in every respect grounded to argue that serfdom was not an unambiguously definable system but only a set of very varying practices.⁷ Or as Hans Hattenhauer has put it: "in fact there was no 'the' serfdom ('die' Leibeigen-

³ F.-W. Henning, "Leibeigenschaft," in *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, A. Erler, E. Kaufmann, ed. *Haustür-Lippe*, Berlin 1978, 2: 1761-1772.

⁴ See above all: Th. Knapp, "Ueber Leibeigenschaft in Deutschland seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanische Abteilung* 19 (1838), 18-19; J. Blum, "The rise of serfdom in eastern Europe," *The American Historical Review* 62 (1957), 807-808; J. Blum, *Lord and peasant in Russia from the ninth to the nineteenth century*. Princeton 1961, 6-9.

⁵ Cf. R. Koselleck, "A response to comments on the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*," in *The meaning of historical terms and concepts: New studies on Begriffsgeschichte*, ed. H. Lehmann, M. Richter, German Historical Institute Washington, D. C., Occasional Paper No. 15. Washington DC 1996, 64-67.

⁶ M. Bush, "Introduction," in *Serfdom and Slavery. Studies in Legal Bondage*, ed. M. L. Bush. London-New York 1996, 11.

⁷ S. Hoch, "The serf economy and the social order in Russia," in *Serfdom and Slavery*, 320; S. L. Hoch, "Serfdom," in *A Historical Guide to World Slavery*, ed. S. Drescher, S. L. Engerman, Oxford 1998, 353-354; A. Kahan, "Notes on serfdom in Western and Eastern Europe," *The Journal of Economic History* 33 (1973), 86; T. K. Dennison, "Did serfdom matter? Russian rural society, 1750-1860," *Historical Research* 79:203 (2006), 82.

schaft) but there were only different peasants' forms of personal dependence on the land and the landlord."⁸

The aim of the present essay is to discuss what the definite universal features of serfdom still could be. That is to look for the "greatest common denominators"⁹ for most of the cases of serfdom. The purpose is not to offer another definition of serfdom or to construct a list of rights of "ideal type" of serfdom.¹⁰ Rather, it offers that the literature on serfdom lets us determine at least (or only) three definite features of this historical institution.

"Serfs" were unfree

Already in 1957 Jerome Blum reached the conclusion that the one feature common to all formations of serfdom in Europe was that a peasant was recognized as unfree.¹¹ When Heide Wunder wanted to analyze the serf relations in Germany then she had to admit that the German word "Leibeigenschaft" had too many confusing meanings, so that using the word "unfreedom" would be even clearer and less inconsistent to speak about peasants' serfdom both in the context of the Middle Ages and early modern period.¹²

The term "serfdom" or "Leibeigenschaft" alone says nothing particular about the actual legal condition of the peasants or whoever was called as "serfs." We can be only sure that "serfs" were always legally and socially unfree. At times the term "serfdom" was even used in the sources in such a simple and direct meaning.¹³ At first glance the word "unfreedom" could even look more vague than the

⁸ H. Hattenhauer, *Europäische Rechtsgeschichte*. 3rd edn., Heidelberg 1999, 515.

⁹ Some recent studies on slavery has had the same goal: E. Herrmann-Otto, "Einführung," in *Unfreie Arbeits- und Lebensverhältnisse von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart. Eine Einführung*, ed. E. Herrmann-Otto, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2005, x-xi. Or as R. Blackburn tried to clarify "a core of features common to the slave status, beyond the great diversity of uses to which slaves have been put": R. Blackburn "Defining Slavery – its Special Features and Social Role," in *Slavery and other forms of unfree labour*, ed. L. J. Archer, London-New York 1988, 263.

¹⁰ E.g. this was the goal for: P. Blicke, "Von der Leibeigenschaft in die Freiheit. Ein Beitrag zu den realhistorischen Grundlagen der Freiheits- und Menschenrechte in Mitteleuropa," in *Grund- und Freiheitsrechte im Wandel von Gesellschaft und Geschichte. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grund- und Freiheitsrechte vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Revolution von 1848*, ed. G. Birtsch, Veröffentlichungen zur Geschichte der Grund- und Freiheitsrechte 1. Göttingen 1981, 27.

¹¹ Blum, "The rise of serfdom," 809; Blum, *Lord and peasant*, 8.

¹² H. Wunder, "Serfdom in later medieval and early modern Germany," in *Social relations and ideas*, Essays in honour of R. H. Hilton, ed. T. H. Aston, P. R. Coss, Ch. Dyer, J. Thirsk, Past and Present Publications, Cambridge 1983, 252; see also: T. Scott, "Wandel und Beharrung der Untertänigkeit: Die südwestdeutsche Leiherrschaft/Leibeigenschaft in komparativer Sicht," in *Untertanen, Herrschaft und Staat in Böhmen und im "Alten Reich". Sozialgeschichtliche Studien zur Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. M. Cerman, R. Luft, Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 99, München 2005, 311.

¹³ E.g., see J. Mikulec, "Der Widerstand gegen den Begriff "Leibeigenschaft" in kritischen Ansichten über die Untertanenstellung im barocken Böhmen," in *Leibeigenschaft*, 209.

term "serfdom," but in fact both terms have almost the same quality. When the term "unfreedom" says nothing about the actual legal status of the "unfree" peasants then the term "serfdom" is not more informative on this matter. Those who were called "serfs" were surely not free but their social, legal and economic conditions varied from region to region and changed during the centuries.

There is a terminology

In addition to the fact that serfdom always indicates unfreedom, it is also certain that there is a historical term or a terminology of "serfdom" (or "Leibeigenschaft," "jobagiones", "vornedskap", "nevolnictví", "părisori" and other original equivalents). The terms of serfdom are then labels for unfree people (in most cases for the peasantry) in different times and territories which occur in the sources and which are taken over into the history literature.

In fact, the problem of serfdom is first of all an issue and a challenge of history of concepts (*Begriffsgeschichte*). Studying the different meanings of "serfdom" over times has the greatest importance for critical understanding of the sources and orientation in the historiography.¹⁴ For example, the outlines of the history of the German concept "Leibeigenschaft" is well-known. According to Renate Blickle, the term "Leibeigen" (*lipeigen*) cropped up in southern and southwestern German territories in the fourteenth to fifteenth century and was first a rather rarely used term. Then it spread step by step towards the north and north-east until it was gradually adopted in the East-Elbian region where the term had its heydays in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹⁵ But that original Middle High German term "lipeigen" reached also into the Scandinavian languages - "livegen." The peasants of the Baltic provinces were called with the term "Leibeigen" for the first time in the last quarter of the sixteenth century (at least already in the 1590s). At the same time the term was taken over into legal language in the other Baltic coastal territories - in Schleswig-Holstein, Vorpommern, Mecklen-

¹⁴ H. E. Bödeker, "Reflexionen über Begriffsgeschichte als Methode," in *Begriffsgeschichte, Diskursgeschichte, Metapherngeschichte*, ed. H. E. Bödeker, Göttinger Gespräche zur Geschichtswissenschaft 14, Göttingen 2002, 73-121; R. Koselleck, "Begriffsgeschichte und Sozialgeschichte," in idem, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*, 2nd edn. Frankfurt a. M. 1984, 109-114. In spite of the importance of the term "Leibeigenschaft" in the history of Germany, this concept cannot be found in: *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. 8 vols. Stuttgart 1972-1997.

¹⁵ R. Blickle, "Leibeigenschaft: Versuch über Zeitgenossenschaft in Wissenschaft und Wirklichkeit, durchgeführt am Beispiel Altbayerns," in *Gutsherrschaft als soziales Modell. Vergleichende Betrachtungen zur Funktionsweise frühneuzeitlicher Agrargesellschaften*, ed. J. Peters, = Historische Zeitschrift, Beiheft 18. München 1995, 58; see also: H. Rabe, "Das Problem Leibeigenschaft. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge einer Ideologisierung und des Verfassungsrechtlichen Wandels von Freiheit und Eigentum im deutschen Bauernkrieg," *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* Beihefte 64 (1977), 30-33; C. Ulbrich, *Leibherrschaft am Oberrhein im Spätmittelalter*. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 58. Göttingen 1979, 11.

burg and elsewhere.¹⁶ Therefore, it appears clearly that not the rights were received but only the term spread. A new word was transferred to the local legal relations that had already existed.¹⁷ And it proves once again that the similar usage of some terms is not enough to determine the local social and legal practices.

A set of rights

However, serfdom was not just someone's unfree status that was named with vernacular or borrowed terms but serfdom always meant that someone had some rights over those who were called "serfs." Thus, it can be stated that serfdom became apparent through landlords' rights that they had over their subjects. Every such right could have many conditions and limitations which could vary between places and times. And it is important to stress that the term "serfdom" itself does not carry the information about what rights these were.

One of the most common ways of defining serfdom has been to give an overview of the essential rights of a lord that he had over his peasants. However, it seems impossible to frame a universal list of such rights that would apply to all territories and time-periods that have been seen as traditional regions of serfdom. At best, one or some cases of serfdom can be characterized¹⁸ but any attempt to give a more universal list of those rights is determined to fail.

As it is known, the Marxist historians stress the economic aspects when speaking about serfdom. According to them the legal aspects and so many different legal practices of serfdom only blur our understanding about its real essence.¹⁹ However, the Marxist broad and very general definition of serfdom that emphasized only its socio-economic aspects is surely not more accurate or universal than the legal ones attempted so far. It is clear that the Marxists' view takes us very far from the concept of how serfdom was understood in the sources where it was still first of all a legal and social term. In other words, Marxists give just a new and their own meaning to the word "serfdom" and so causing even a bigger confusion if one tries to keep contact with the sources. One of the clearest characteristics of serfdom – landlords' power over peasant – was still first a legal position and only thereafter an economic relationship. Precisely the landlords' rights

¹⁶ See D. Schleinert, "Personenrechtliche Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse im Herzogtum Pommern-Wolgast zwischen Reformation und Dreißigjährigem Krieg," in *Leibeigenschaft*, 28–29; J. Klußmann, "Leibeigenschaft im frühneuzeitlichen Schleswig-Holstein: Rechtliche Entwicklung, öffentlicher Diskurs und bäuerliche Perspektive," in *Leibeigenschaft*, 215; E. Münch, "Mecklenburg und das Problem der Leibeigenschaft Mitte des 16. bis Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts," in *Leibeigenschaft*, 7.

¹⁷ Cf. K. Andrmann, "Leibeigenschaft in der Markgrafschaft Baden an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit," in P. Freedman, M. Bourin, eds. *Forms of servitude in Northern and Central Europe: decline, resistance, and expansion*, Medieval texts and cultures of Northern Europe 9, Turnhout 2005, 202.

¹⁸ See e.g. M. Bush, "Serfdom in medieval and modern Europe: a comparison," in *Serfdom and slavery*, 199–224.

¹⁹ See J. M. Bak, "Serfs and serfdom: Words and things," *Review* 4:1 (Summer 1980), 3–18.

that they had obtained determined their opportunity to exploit the peasants economically.²⁰

According to Marxists an economic explanation also helps us to differentiate serfdom from slavery. In their view, unlike slaves, the serfs kept a farmstead with their own means of production.²¹ This was indeed a very typical look of serf economy but it cannot be taken as a universal criterion for serfdom. In many cases of serfdom the "serfs" did not have more property rights or the rights to use the means of production than the "slaves" who had been given a plot of land.²² Also the work time of the "serfs" could be more dependent on their lord's demands than that of "slaves." Not less important is the fact that the "serfs" were not only farming peasants but often also the household servants of a lord of the manor or just landless villagers (including farm hands and artisans).²³ There were "serfs" who lived in towns or did some other work with the permission of their lord (e.g. *obrok*-peasants in Russia or the medieval serfs under *Leibherrschaft*).²⁴ Most of them were usually called "serfs" due to landlords' property right over them and socially they stood on the same level as the farming "serfs."

However, not only economically but also legally it is complicated to find a concrete feature that made serfdom and slavery so different. Similarly to serfdom, slavery has not found a satisfactory definition so far.²⁵ Slavery has even longer history and more different forms of appearances that do not bear any uniform legal, social or economic characteristic, except slaves' unfree status legally or socially. It can be agreed that in most cases the "serfs" were more free than the "slaves." Nevertheless, it is not a universal criterion either as it was not always so. Thus, it seems that it is easier to take serfdom for one historical form of slavery than to prove their differences.²⁶

On the other hand, in the historiographical discourses the indefiniteness of serfdom is not usually a problem. Although every author can understand serf-

²⁰ Bak, "Serfs and serfdom," 7, 14; cf. S. L. Hoch, *Serfdom and social control in Russia: Petrovskoe, a village in Tambov*. Chicago 1986, 1, 187.

²¹ See e.g.: Rosdolsky, "On the nature of peasant serfdom," 135, 138; R. H. Hilton, R. E. F. Smith, "Introduction," in R. E. F. Smith, *The Enserfment of the Russian Peasantry*, Cambridge 1968, 3; C. Goehrke, "Leibeigenschaft," in *Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft. Eine vergleichende Enzyklopädie*, 3 vols. Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1969, 1404; M. Wiese, *Leibeigene Bauern und Römisches Recht im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein Gutachten des David Mevius*. Schriften zur Europäischen Rechts- und Verfassungsgeschichte 52. Berlin 2006, 15; Bush, "Introduction," 3.

²² For some such examples see: D. B. Davis, "Introduction: The Problem of Slavery," in *A Historical Guide to World Slavery*, ed. S. Drescher, S. L. Engerman, Oxford 1998, ix-x; K. M. Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South*. New York 1956, 164-165; R. Blackburn, "Slave exploitation and the elementary structures of enslavement," in *Serfdom and Slavery*, 169-171.

²³ See also e.g. Scott, "Wandel und Beharrung," 314.

²⁴ E.g. Ulbrich, *Leibherrschaft*, 260; Henning, *Leibeigenschaft*, 1761.

²⁵ See D. B. Davis, *Inhuman bondage. The rise and fall of slavery in the New World*. Oxford 2006, 27-47; Herrmann-Otto, "Einführung," x.

²⁶ Cf. W. Davies. "On servile status in the early Middle Ages," in *Serfdom and Slavery*, 225.

dom differently in addition to the fact that in every region and historical context "serfdom" means a different thing, then still this word's appearance in a text does not derange us much. At least there is no need to abandon this uncertain historical term as there is no better word for replacement. One of the main reasons to speak about serfdom in one or another region is precisely the so far historical tradition that is accepted in the local academic historiography.

In essence it is not important how to label one or other social groups' status. Of course, the words themselves (their usage and history) are also interesting, but if the aim of a study is a clarification of the actual status of the social groups then a discussion only about social-historical terms is surely not very fruitful. As Tom Scott accentuated it lately: the vague character of serfdom does not mean that the features of serfdom separately would be non analyzable.²⁷

To sum up, there are at least three definite features of serfdom if one wants to accept that there was at all such thing as serfdom. However, all these three features (unfreedom, terminology and set of someone's rights) are still very nondescript and say nothing distinctive about serfdom (the same conclusions can be made on slavery). It means that serfdom cannot be defined through some specific legal, economic or social criteria. It was a form of unfreedom that was usually named with some local or borrowed terms but had no universal or specific character. Therefore, it is also useless to debate where and when the "real" serfdom existed or was introduced. Serfdom itself cannot be introduced but only some rights of one social group over the other social group can be fixed. But the set of these rights which was already called "serfdom" was always very different.

²⁷ Scott, "Wandel und Beharrung," 307.

Yemen and the Socialist Countries, 1955–1970

ZOLTÁN PRANTNER



Our doctoral dissertation is divided into 10 thematically organized parts. As the history of Yemen is said to be an unknown part of the Hungarian scholarly literature we do not only focus on the relationship with the socialist countries. We think that the history of the background is indispensable for a thorough analysis of this difficult and complex relationship. In accordance with this we paid attention to the important events of Yemen's internal policy as well as its international consequences.

In the first chapter the detailed history of the Arab monarchy was presented. Within the framework of this period we outlined the social division of Yemen, the power of the monarchy, the hopeless economic conditions as well as the undeveloped education system and healthcare. In this context we came to the conclusion that the backwardness of the conservative regime gave lots of chances for the socialist countries to exercise influence in the country.

We also devoted a significant part to presenting the opposition movements, which appeared with the claim to reform or even overthrow the political system. Their birth can be dated from the defeat by Saudi Arabia in 1934. At that time their aim was only to change the regime with peaceful means. However, they started to radicalize due to the dynastical crisis, the experience of the students who studied abroad and as a result of the ideas of Arab nationalism. Following from this it can be concluded that the revolution of September, 1962 was bound to happen. Only the time of it remained uncertain.

In the second unit of our work we studied the relationship between the Yemen monarchy and the socialist countries. Two periods can be separated thematically. The first, almost 10-year-long period started in 1928 when the Soviet-Yemen relations became official. The reason behind it can be found in their mutual dependence. In connection with this we reflected on Yahja imam's most important aim in foreign policy after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, namely the restoration of Great-Yemen. However, the southern part of the country was under the supervision of Great Britain. With this Britain wanted to secure the sea routes to India and the oil concerns. Because of the limited resources the monarch of Yemen was not able to oppose the British effectively in the evolving confrontation. In this situation he needed to ask for foreign support. The Soviet Union was

said to be an attractive version from different points of view. Besides compensating for the Italian influence in Yemen, the Soviets had a perfect anti-imperialistic policy; moreover the geographical distance could prevent this power from becoming involved in internal politics.

For Yemen's request Moscow's answer was positive. It started to make an attempt to create an economic influence in the Persian Gulf or in East-Africa and to cooperate with the opposing powers of the Muslim states.

We wanted to emphasize that it was not only the economic perspectives that were important in the Soviet approach to Yemen between the two world wars but the imam's efforts against the British and the Italians were also respected.

In connection with the decline of the relationship we can say that it was caused by the Soviet Union's weak economic potential, which could not make the maximum use of the advantages possible. Moreover, it was helped by the dynamic advance of Italy and Germany, which first lead to the revision of the relations, then to the reduction of them. It is important to emphasize that the Soviet Union was able to keep a distance from the vision of the socialist revolutions all around the world by deepening the connection with the totally different system of Yemen in its foreign policy.

There was a new chance in the 1950s to restore the relations. It was due to many new conditions, like the Soviet Union's new approach to the Arabic states after Stalin's death or the ambition to increase the number of anti-imperialist allies during the cold war. However, in this period not only the Soviet Union could renew the connections, but we can also witness the creation of new connections with China and the Eastern-European countries. Although the financial assistance to the monarchy and the slow modernization of the army and infrastructure did not help China deepen the relations. Besides talking about the details of the aids we discussed the spread of Arab nationalism, which seemed to be the biggest obstacle of the socialist influence. We stated that their support was only necessary as long as the imam could use it for his national interests. The fall of the United Arab States and Cairo's action against the monarchy had serious effects on these slowly progressing relations inasmuch as the sovereign decided to close it radically for the protection of his system.

There was a similar chance for the creation of the Hungarian-Yemeni connections, which was analyzed in the third chapter. We stressed that the most important reason for that was to break out from the isolation on the stage of the Hungarian foreign policy after the events of the 1956 revolution. Because of our country's geographical and financial conditions it was not able to and did not even want to create strategic goals like Moscow. Similarly to the other socialist countries the stress was on widening the commercial relations, which turned out to be a failure not even under the monarchy but at the beginning of the republic, too.

In the fourth part of the dissertation the events of the revolution in September, 1962 are analyzed with the problems of Cairo's interaction and the long process of the recognition of the new republic. It can be stated that most of the Arabic republics and the socialist countries accepted the new system of Yemen. The main

reason for it was the government's nationalist and socialist attitude, as well as its negative standpoint towards the Western camp. Although, the question of acknowledgement rose in connection with the inter-Arab conflict soon after the involvement of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Great Britain. As a result, the establishment of the diplomatic connections with the new government of Yemen depended on the supporting partners' point of view, and the civil war became the substitute for the Arabic cold war.

In the next chapter the problems of the newly established republic were presented. The overthrow of the monarchy was not supported unanimously by the population. The country became divided into two parts and a civil war began. The dragging on of the conflict – in our opinion – was due not only to the intervention of the UAR and Saudi Arabia, but also to the failure of the international attempt to solve the problem, as well as to the problems of the formulating republic. The socialist countries were determined to keep the political distance with the republicans, because they did not want to risk the chance of the western intervention and the breakdown of the balance in the Persian Gulf. Likewise, it was ascertained that Saana's direct support was only economic and diplomatic to avoid the disturbance of the working relations with Nasser's Egypt.

From the beginning the socialist countries were adherent to the republican system. However, their indirect support was very moderate until 1964, due to the Egyptian hegemony in the rule of Saana. The first chance for direct negotiations came in the spring of 1964 when Egypt seemed to leave Yemen to itself by liquidating the military presence in the country. In the sixth chapter we presented the negotiations of Yemen's delegation in Moscow, Prague, Sofia, Berlin, Bucharest, Budapest, and Beijing with special emphasis on the Hungarian visit's results. In connection with the negotiations we reached the conclusion that those were successful concerning the agreements and support; however in practice they showed less efficiency. Commodities were still delivered with Egyptian cooperation. President Sallal could not have himself accepted as the country's sovereign leader, and the internal affairs were still led by the UAR's officials. In conclusion, it can be said that the conferences could not reach their original aim; therefore they can be rated as a failure.

The period between 1964–1967 was characterized by the different attempts for solutions such as the diplomatic and the armed. In the seventh chapter we outlined the reasons behind the divided republican side, the process of disorganization, the birth of the Jeddah Agreement whose aim was to finish the civil war, and the fulfillment of the Egyptian hegemony. From the socialist countries' point of view it meant the continuation of the policy toward Yemen, which also met with Cairo's interests. In practice it meant the realization of the aid promised in the contract of 1964 related to the improvement of the highway system of Yemen, as well as the health care and education system. All of it changed only after the fall of 1967 when the UAR needed to withdraw its troops from Yemen due to the defeat in the Six Day War.

In the eighth chapter the dynamism of the Hungarian-Yemeni relations was presented. After 1964 our country focused on the fulfillment of the assumed obli-

gation related to the contract of 1964. Besides it helped to deepen the two countries' relationship. It contained health supply, an economic delegation was sent to check the precise demands of Yemen. The number of scholarships between the two countries was raised. A Hungarian crew shot a documentary movie about the country. The most serious supply was the installment of a public health institution and its cooperation with the Hungarian staff. It also can be observed that there was no high increase in the trade connections after Sallal president's visit in Budapest, because the Hungarian partner did not see any hope for that.

In the ninth part the Six Day War's consequences in Yemen were analyzed. As we observed the leadership of UAR could not continue its mission in Yemen due to the defeat from Israel. After the Khartoum agreement the UAR gave up its position in return for the financial support from Saudi Arabia with which it was able to recover its damaged economy. After the leaving of the Egyptian forces the republican system seemed to break up but due to the socialist countries' sudden assistance the main attack of the royalist forces turned out to be a failure. Apart from helping in the very critical situations there was no unconditional commitment of the Saana system toward these countries. What is more, the opposite happened when the republicans could carry out effective activity toward the closing of the civil war, making the peace as well as stabilizing their weak foreign relations. As far as the internal affairs were concerned the socialist countries were disappointed because of the strengthening right-wing political forces and newly revitalized relations with the West in Yemen. Thanks to that the previous started to focus on the revolutionary South-Yemen.

In the last chapter we came to a conclusion that the relationship between Hungary and Yemen remained political during our period. In the spirit of solidarity our country offered economy aid, scholarship programs, training of experts and public health assistance. In contrast with the agreement Hungarian doctors worked in the hospitals installed by Hungarians. Hungary was open-minded toward the wide range of necessities of Yemen but it failed due to the absence of the requested data. As we observed the Hungarians did not expect any change related to this, and the sign of the declining relations was the lack of the high-level meetings. After this they focused on the Middle East region, where they hoped more economic and political advantages.

Hungary and Ethiopia: Formal and Informal Relations, 1868–1941

BALÁZS SZÉLINGER



1) The aims, sources and methodology of the study

The dissertation's main objective is to outline the relations between Hungary and Ethiopia from their beginnings to the Second World War. These relations can be formal (commerce, politics) and informal (travel writing, press, fiction). The topic is reasonable because in the era of imperialism Ethiopia resisted to colonization, thus she was the only one independent country in the Sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore in Hungary there was a relatively significant interest in Ethiopia.

This study is based on both primary and secondary sources. In Hungary the National Archives (Budapest), the Archives of the Geographical Museum (Érd), the records of the Munkácsy Museum (Békéscsaba) have been used, and abroad the Public Record Office (London), Drzavni Arhiv u Rijeci (Fiume) and the Archives of Wales. The majority of these documents are used here for the first time. There are also published documents among the sources, and both Hungarian and foreign language monographs on the subject are discussed. The dissertation is organized chronologically with a wide spectrum of the events. There are numerous quotations in the text; the study would be poor without their content, arguments, contemporary idioms, and language.

2) The structure of the dissertation

There are four chapters in this dissertation including sub-chapters. Chapter I includes the era unfolding the early Hungarian-Ethiopian relations to World War I. Since the second half of the nineteenth century, there had been a growing interest in Ethiopia according to the contemporary Hungarian press. In this era the first Hungarian travellers got to Ethiopia. One of them, Franz Hassen (probably of Saxon origin) lived there for decades and married an Ethiopian woman. Counts Sámuel Teleki and Vilmos Zichy were adventurers and hunters of the aristocracy. The latter fought against Ethiopia as an officer in the Egyptian army and died in the war of 1875.

There is a sub-chapter to show the relations of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Italy with a special attention to the Italian imperialism. Italy's fiascos in Africa (1887, 1896) were great motivations for her to maintain the Triple Alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary, even though there were serious tensions between the members. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy disfavoured Italy's African attempts because these weakened the Triple Alliance's potentials in Europe.

In the same chapter the evolution of the commercial relations is also presented from the career of the first successful businessmen (and even a businesswoman) through the official commercial treaty (Ludwig Höhnel's mission in 1905) to the establishment of the consulate of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in Addis Ababa (1912). The Ethiopian delegations are also mentioned which visited Austria and Hungary in 1907 and 1914.

There are new historical data about the adventurous life of Károly Inger (aka Suleyman ibn Inger Abdullah). The dissertation points out that Inger really travelled in Africa, but the great majority of his statements are false. At the same time, it becomes clear that the contemporary Hungarian government supported Inger's colonizing aims in Somalia. Count Lajos Königsegg's three novels are also analyzed with a special attention to the possibility that these fictions were based on true stories.

Chapter II is discussing the era between the two World Wars. The lack of the diplomatic connections between Hungary and Ethiopia was significant in this era. Even so there were dozens of Hungarian emigrants to Ethiopia. Thanks to the detailed biographical data, the motivations of the émigrés could be analyzed. Besides wanderlust and personal misfortune, the Trianon Peace Treaty's social consequences cannot be neglected regarding the fact that the majority of the émigrés were intellectuals (physicians, ex-military officers, bank officials), who impoverished in Hungary. There are detailed data about two Hungarian medical doctors' (Kálmán Mészáros and László Sáska) African career, from their settlement in Ethiopia to their struggles during and after the Italo-Ethiopian war in 1935-1936. There are also parts about the two most successful Hungarians in Ethiopia, Mátyás Gajdács (who lived there the longest time as a Hungarian between 1911 and 1965) and Sándor Dörflinger. Only the two of them were financially successful in Ethiopia in this era. Gajdács, who was a taxidermist, became a worldwide known ornithologist and the first description of Ethiopia's bird fauna was made by him.

Chapter III deals with the Italo-Ethiopian war and the related international conflict in 1935-1936. The aim is to show that the war in Ethiopia indirectly affected Hungary's foreign policy. There is a detailed analysis concerning every aspect of the matter. Since at that time fascist Italy was the only ally of Hungary, the latter got into serious trouble. On the one hand, because the Italian army fought in Africa, Italy's Central-European influence in connection with Hungary became doubtful. This confused the Hungarian government led by Gyula Gömbös as far as the revision of the Trianon Peace Treaty was concerned, since – as it is clear from the documents – until 1935 a peaceful revision was their conception with Italy's diplomatic support. On the other hand, somewhat unexpected-

edly, the League of Nations condemned Italy as an aggressor state, thus Hungary had to vote about the notorious sanctions. In this tender and grave situation the Hungarian politicians decided precipitately to abstain from beans. However, due to this decision the Western Powers accused Hungary of being disloyal to the League of Nations and to the policy of the collective security.

Many Hungarian politicians stated the case. Besides the speeches in the Hungarian parliament, Ferenc Herczeg's (as president of the Revisionist League) and Count István Bethlen's writings are discussed in detail. The dissertation argues that the Italo-Ethiopian conflict had a great impact on the Hungarian foreign policy, and as a direct consequence Hungary began to look to Germany as her primary ally, giving up the possibility of a peaceful revision.

There is a sub-chapter about the contemporary Hungarian press. The vast majority of this, under political pressure, published pro-Italian articles. The rare exception was the political magazine called "Századunk". Its editor-in-chief, Imre Csécsy, entered into a debate with the well-known (but pro-Italian) Ignotus. Moreover, another Hungarian periodical in Kolozsvár ("Korunk") deserves special attention because it could write freely and objectively about Italian Fascism because Rumania was against Italy in the international conflict.

As the ally of Italy, it was permitted to Hungary to send a military observer to the Ethiopian front. Captain József Németh was chosen but his fair objectivity caused him trouble. He held lectures about his observations, the weak equipment and the brutality of the Italian army, and it caused a diplomatic scandal in Budapest.

There were also two Hungarian war correspondents in Ethiopia: László Faragó (Ladislav Farago) and Ödön Demeter (Edmund Demaitre). It is emphasized that their activity was important not only in the history of the journalism. A part about Béla Menczer introduces this extraordinary person who was a political advisor beside the emigrant Ethiopian government in London between 1936 and 1940.

Chapter IV focuses on the "colonization" of Ethiopia, i.e. the relations between Italian East Africa and Hungary. As an ally of the Fascist Italy, Hungary tried to cash in her previous stand by Italy in the League of Nations. The Hungarian-Ethiopian Commercial Ltd. was established already in 1936 and even younger Miklós Horthy, the governor's son was among the founders. Hungary contracted a colonial agreement with Italy in 1937, which fixed a two million-lire clearing. Hungary imported mainly tropical fruits and coffee, while she exported machines and motors to Ethiopia. The latter were manufactured in the Hungarian Machine Works and Ganz Co., but there are documents about the business of the Pick Salami Factory in Szeged.

In the meantime the Italian promises about Hungarian plantations remained unfulfilled in spite of the support of the Hungarian diplomacy because Italy could not pacify Ethiopia. In Hungary there was significant interest in emigrating and settling in Ethiopia but the Italian state refused it.

There is a sub-chapter about the Hungarian Fascist journalist Tibor Ratkóczy, who travelled to Ethiopia in 1938 with the special permission of the Italian gov-

ernment. Although his reports are full of fascist and chauvinistic parts, his book is a primary source about Italian East Africa.

In the end, the study discusses the activity of the two previously mentioned doctors during and after the Italo-Ethiopian war. Kálmán Mészáros joined the International Red Cross staff and worked for it until the last moment of the war. László Sáska was not working on the fronts, but he became an eye-witness of the war crimes committed by Italians (genocide, poison gas, etc.). His accounts about these events were used later at international forums.

There is an appendix attached to the dissertation with a chronology, photographs, maps, and an important part of Béla Menczer's autobiography concerning his connections to the emigrant Ethiopian government in London.

3) Contribution to field

A history of the Hungarian-Ethiopian relations is a novelty in itself. It has many aspects, and not only the formal political and commercial connections are discussed, but also the informal side. It is a new approach to present and analyze the interpretation of a Sub-Saharan country in the Hungarian press and fiction. There are new details in the political history too, focusing on the dilemma of the Hungarian foreign policy in 1935-1936. The evolution of the commercial relations (especially concerning Italian East Africa) and the activity of the Hungarian émigrés and many travellers have not been revealed until now.

4) Perspectives

As past cannot be discovered in its originality, thus this dissertation is not complete. During the discussion of the several matters of the study it was pointed out that some of the sources (diaries, rare newspapers) are still missing. The prospective emergence of these sources could make this study more complete.

Beyond that, although this dissertation ends with World War II, the study should be continued in the future. In the 1950s diplomatic connections were established again between Hungary and Ethiopia and in the following decades (until the early 1990s) there was a vivid and friendly relation between the two states. In Ethiopia dozens of Hungarian firms acted while hundreds of Ethiopian students visited Hungarian universities and high schools. The number of the Hungarian physicians working in Ethiopia during the 1970s and 1980s was also significant.

Eastern Europe and the international trade in the eighth–tenth centuries (on the basis of written sources)

SZABOLCS POLGÁR



The aim of the dissertation was to collect and analyze the written sources on the Eastern European trade contacts in the eighth–tenth centuries. The chapters of this work are: 1) Introduction; 2) Sources; 3) Europe and the international trade in the early Middle Ages; 4) Merchants, tradesmen, mediators and the peoples of Eastern Europe in the early Middle Ages; 5) Wares; 6) Trade routes; 7) The forms of trade, transport, markets; 8) Towns, religious, political and cultural connections between Eastern Europe and the neighboring civilizations; 9) Trade contacts of the Carpathian basin after the Hungarian conquest; 10) Summary; 11) Bibliography and maps.

Eastern Europe is a large territory from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea and the Caucasian mountains and from the Carpathian mountains to the Volga and Kama rivers. The political history of Eastern Europe from the defeat of the Huns (469) to the end of the seventh century is characterized by great migrations. The Oghurs, Onoghurs, Saraghurs, Kutrighurs, Utighurs, Avars, the Turks and perhaps the Protobulghars came from the East, the Slavic tribes came from the North. In the first half of the seventh century Kuvrat khan's Bulgharia emerged, which was conquered by the Khazars after the death of Kuvrat (665). The dominant power of Eastern Europe became the Khazar Kaghhanate from the end of the seventh century to the end of the tenth century.

The Eastern European nomadic empires had multilateral relations with the neighboring civilizations such as the Roman and later the Byzantine Empire and the Sasanide Persia and later the Caliphate. The Arab conquest radically changed the political situation in Persia, Central Asia and the Transcaucasian region in the second half of the seventh century and at the beginning of the eighth century. In the first half of the eighth century the Khazars were at war with the Caliphate. The Byzantine Empire tried to have friendly relations with the Khazars. At the end of the seventh century the Khazars conquered a few Byzantine towns in the Eastern part of the Crimea, but the danger from the Caliphate helped on the alliance between them.

From the end of the eighth century a new period began in trade contacts of Eastern Europe. It was a period of booming trade. In the ninth and tenth centuries Eastern Europe took part more considerably in world trade than in the earlier centuries. The Khazars played a key role in the international trade since they controlled the main routes. One of them was the north-south route system, the Fur Road which led from the eastern European forest zone to Byzantium and the Caliphate (The Volga-Kama route and the Dnieper route). The other route was the north western part of the Silk Road. The Volga route and the Silk Road intersected in the Lower Volga region. It is no accident that the new capital of the Khazars was set up there after the Arab-Khazar wars.

The lands and peoples of Eastern Europe which took part in the international trade were: Khazaria, Volga Bulgharia, the Rus state, the Hungarians, the Pechenegs (after 894), Eastern Slavic tribes (Viatichians, Radimichians, Severians etc.), the Burtas people, the inhabitants of the forest zone: the Chuds, Livs, Letgals, Zemgals, Merias, Muromas, Mordvins, Cheremis people, the tribes of Wisû (Ves'), Yugra (Yûra), Ar (land) and Bjarmaland (Biarmia, Perm). There were professional tradesmen who played an important role in the trade: Muslims (especially the Khwarizmians), Rus (Russians), Jews (Rahdanites) and Greeks (Byzantines). As for the Muslims and Jews, some came from Western Europe, or the Caliphate, but others lived in Khazaria, Volga Bulgharia or the Rus. The Muslim Khwarazmians lived in Khazaria, Volga Bulgharia, the Rus, among the Hungarians and the Pechenegs.

The export wares were furs, slaves, honey, wax, yellow amber, weapons, horses, sheep, fish-glue, wood, salt, tusks of walrus or mammoth. The import wares were: textile materials, silk, clothes, silver dirhams, gold, glass beads, precious stones, jewels, cowrie, teak (wood), spices, wine, and fruits.

The main routes were: 1) The route "from the Varangians to the Greeks" that is the Dnieper route system (from the Baltic sea to Constantinople). 2) The Volga route which connected the Baltic zone with the Caspian sea. 3) The Don route (between the upper Volga and the Black sea). 4) The Silk road, and the routes between Eastern Europe and Central Asia (Khwarizm, Transoxania, Khorasan). 5) The land routes between Eastern Europe (Khazaria, Rus and Volga Bulgharia) and Central (and Western) Europe. 6) The sea routes of the Black sea.

There were markets in the trade centers. There are sources on the so called silent trade and on the "gift trade". The Russian translations of the two (or three) commercial treaties have been preserved. They provide important pieces of information on the trade of the Byzantine Empire with the northern "barbarian" neighbors. A Hungarian scholar, Charles (Károly) Polányi and others elaborated a theoretical model on the "archaic" or preindustrial commercial system between the developed civilizations and the undeveloped societies. According to Polányi's model, the "backwards" developed special foreign trade connections with the developed civilizations, which were under state control. The tradesmen coming from the developed countries were required to be in business on the special markets, the ports of trade. There were ports of trade in Eastern Europe in the eighth-

tenth centuries: e.g., Tamatarcha on the Taman-peninsula, town Etil on the lower Volga, port Bulghar in Volga Bulgharia.

The incomes of the Khazars derived from three sources: 1) Taxes or rates; 2) Customs duties; 3) Services. How large incomes could the Khazars have from the trade? The Khazars could have a share in the profit of the trade in two ways: 1) Direct commercial duties of the merchants coming from foreign countries (commercial tithe); 2) The merchants living among the Khazars took part in the commerce, they presumably exported furs and other goods to the Islamic countries. In the ninth century the fur trade was controlled by the Khazars. It was a very favorable position for the Khazars, but it did not last for long. At the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century two new states emerged which became rivals of the Khazars: the Rus and the Volga Bulgars. The origins of Rus were in connection with the migrations of Scandinavians into Northern Russia. The different groups of Scandinavians began to settle in the forest zone of North Western Russia from the eighth century. In the ninth century their earliest center was beside the Lake Ladoga. The commercial boom in Eastern Europe had an attraction for the commercial activity of the Rus. The Rus merchants travelled frequently into Kherson city (in the south western part of the Crimean Peninsula) and Constantinople. Their other main direction was the Volga Bulgharia and Khazaria. They mostly sold the wares in the towns of Bulgharia and Khazaria but occasionally reached the southern coast of the Caspian Sea and Iraq. The eastern trade connections of the Rus were under the control of the Volga Bulgars and the Khazars, the Rus merchants had to pay commercial tithe.

The other new state, the Volga Bulgharia was one of the vassals of Khazaria up to 922. The Volga Bulgars were formed from different tribes migrating from the South Russian steppes to the region of the confluence the Volga and Kama rivers. The earliest reports on the Volga Bulgars were recorded in the second half of the ninth century by Muslim geographers.

From the end of the ninth century there were a few events which contributed to the decline of the Khazar power over Eastern Europe. The first of them was the migration of the Pechenegs in the middle of the 890s. The Pechenegs entered by force into the South Russian steppes and expelled the Hungarians who were allies of the Khazars. The Khazars lost the control over the steppe region between the Don and Danube rivers. The Pechenegs did not become the vassals of the Khazars. The withdrawal of the Hungarians from the Dnieper region helped on the political activity of the Rus. A Russian prince Oleg conquered the forest steppe zone in the Dnieper region and Kiev which became the capital of the Rus state. There are reports in the Russian Primary Chronicle that Prince Oleg imposed tax on the Slavic tribes of the middle Dnieper and Oka region such as the Drevlians, Severians and Radimiches. It meant that the Khazars lost the control in the forest zone and forest steppe zone, between the Dnieper and the Upper Volga, that is the western region of the home of furs. The next shock for the Khazars was the secession of the Volga Bulgharia from the Khazar Kaghanate. The Bulghar king Almush officially converted into the Islam in 922 and issued his own silver coins. It was a symbolic act of independence. The main problem for

the Khazars was that they lost control over the peoples of the Upper Volga region, that is the forest zone, the home of furs.

The reduction of the lands of furs caused the reduction of the commercial incomes of the Khazar Empire. Muslim authors mentioned that the Khazar mercenary troops did not get enough salary in the middle of the tenth century. The expansive ambition of the Kievan Rus increased in the 960's under the reign of prince Sviatoslav. The Khazar-Rus relations were peaceful up to this time. At the beginning of the tenth century the Khazars let the Russian troops pass through to Khazaria to attack the South Caspian region. Around 960 the military marches across the Kaghannate were already prohibited by the Khazar kings. In 964 prince Sviatoslav conquered a Slavic people, the Viatichians who paid tribute to the Khazars. The Rus dealt the Khazars a heavy blow in 965 and 969. The Khazars lost their role in the intermediary trade. The Volga Bulgars could continue the trade with the East, but the volume of the trade was a bit reduced at the beginning of the eleventh century. Neither the Bulgars nor the Rus could control the whole Volga route, because the new nomadic tribe confederation the Oghuzes migrating from the Kazakh steppe prevented them.

As all over the world, the cultural and religious contacts between different societies, civilizations were facilitated by the trade. The first wave of the spread of Islam in Eastern Europe was in the Khazar period. The Islam took roots in the Volga and Caucasus regions in the ninth-tenth centuries. In the towns of Khazaria and Volga Bulgaria Muslim communities existed. In addition, Jews, Christians, and believers of other religions lived there. In this region the elements of urban culture of the Islamic civilization appeared (market-places, mosques, baths, Koran-schools). The Caucasus-Volga-Don zone had contacts with the Islamic world and the Byzantine civilization alike. The western part, the Dnieper region was even more under the influence of the Byzantine civilization. It could be concluded that this peripheral zone north of the Black sea and the Caucasus had many cultural and religious impulses from the neighboring developed cultural centers during this period.

As for the Hungarians before the conquest of the Carpathian basin, they joined in the international trade, sold Slave captives in the Crimean Peninsula. There were foreign traders among the Hungarians. After the conquest the Hungarians reorganized the commercial connections of the Carpathian basin. In the tenth century this area was incorporated into the international trade, partly in the Eastern European trade.

General Information for Authors of Chronica

In order to ensure conformity of style within each volume and to facilitate the editorial process, authors are asked to submit their manuscripts according to the guidelines which appear below.

The Editorial Board only accepts papers submitted in major languages. It is the duty of the Editorial Board to make the papers proof-read by native proof-readers.

Provide two printed copies of your paper and a machine-readable copy (on disc or CD-ROM or via e-mail) preferably prepared in MSWord or WordPerfect. The word-processor and version used should be stipulated. Be sure to indicate the file name under which your text is stored on disc at the end of the printed copy.

Use A4 paper (210×297 mm). 12 point font-size, double-space and use one inch (2,54 cm) margins all around for editorial amendments and eventual corrections. If possible, use Times New Roman font-face, in other cases, submit the True Type font set in electronic format. Use minimal text-formatting (cursive), hyphenation should be switched off. Paragraphs are headed by Tabs, not spaces!

Prepare footnotes not endnotes. Notes are to be placed at the bottom of page with continuous numbering formatted the same way as the main text.

For the style of references consult the present volume of CHRONICA. The translation of references published in non-major languages should be provided in square-shape brackets.

All recognized abbreviations are accepted, however, best avoided unless they are well known and serve a useful purpose. Abbreviations should be in conformance to the language of the paper or should be given in Latin.

Gazetteer: Toponyms should be in conformance with the language of the paper: e. g. Vienna or Wien; Nuremberg or Nürnberg. Different present-day names should be provided in brackets: e. g. Spalato (Split).

Quotations: Double quotes, except for quotations within quotations (single quotes). For omissions, use: [...]. Quotations exceeding 5 lines should be indented.

Illustrations (maps, diagrams, figures) can only be reproduced in black and white and should be submitted in (both electronic and printed) final format. Captions, legends and other additions should be submitted separately indicating the proper place in the text. Authors are responsible for obtaining permission to reprint material from the copyright holder.

Manuscripts and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be addressed to Chronica, Institute of History, University of Szeged, 2 Egyetem u., H-6722 Szeged, Hungary; chronica@primus.arts.u-szeged.hu

ISSN 1588 2039



9 771588 203008



09

VOLUME 9-10 (2009-2010)

CHRONICA